

APPENDIX II

TAB M

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
3 TAMMY KITZMILLER; BRYAN AND
4 CHRISTY REHM; DEBORAH FENIMORE
5 AND JOEL LIEB; STEVEN STOUGH;
6 BETH EVELAND; CYNTHIA SNEATH;
7 JULIE SMITH; AND ARALENE ("BARRIE")
8 D. AND FREDERICK B. CALLAHAN,

9 Plaintiffs,

Civil Action No.:

v.

04-CV-2688 (M.D. Pa.)

10 DOVER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT;
11 DOVER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD
12 OF DIRECTORS,

13 Defendants.

14 DEPONENT: STEVE WILLIAM FULLER, PH.D.
15 DATE: Tuesday, June 21, 2005
16 TIME: 9:35 a.m.
17 LOCATION: 24 Frank Lloyd Wright Drive
18 Ann Arbor, Michigan

19 APPEARANCES:

20 For the Plaintiffs:

21 MR. ERIC ROTHCHILD
22 Pepper Hamilton, LLP
23 3000 Two Logan Square, 18th and Arch Streets
24 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19130-2799
25 (215) 981-4000

For the Defendants:

MR. PATRICK T. GILLEN (P47456)
Thomas More Law Center
3475 Plymouth Road, Suite 100
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105
(734) 827-2001

<p>1 REPORTED BY: Robert Edward Bonck, CSR-3530 Certified Shorthand Reporter</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 INDEX</p> <p>5 WITNESS:</p> <p>6 STEVE WILLIAM FULLER, PH.D.</p> <p>7 Examination by Mr. Rothschild 3</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 EXHIBITS:</p> <p>14 Fuller Deposition Exhibit No. 1 23</p> <p>15 Fuller Deposition Exhibit No. 2 94</p> <p>16 Fuller Deposition Exhibit No. 3 97</p> <p>17 Fuller Deposition Exhibit No. 4 142</p> <p>18 Fuller Deposition Exhibit No. 5 151</p> <p>19 Fuller Deposition Exhibit No. 6 192</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>2</p> <p>4</p> <p>1 Q You can call me Eric.</p> <p>2 A All right.</p> <p>3 Q I understand from your expert report that you've never been an expert witness at a trial before; is that correct?</p> <p>4 A That is correct.</p> <p>5 Q Have you ever been retained as an expert witness in any capacity prior to this, an expert witness in litigation prior to this proceeding?</p> <p>6 A No. I have talked to lawyers, but apparently these cases didn't go to trial. And so nothing ever happened.</p> <p>7 Q But were you actually retained in a --</p> <p>8 A No, no.</p> <p>9 Q Have you ever testified at a trial --</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q -- under any other circumstances?</p> <p>12 A No, I have not.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Have you ever testified at a deposition before?</p> <p>14 A No, I have not.</p> <p>15 Q I'm just going to tell you a little bit about the process. I'm sure Pat's explained some of it to you, but let me do it on the record. I'm going to be asking you questions, and you'll answer my questions. And Bob here will take those -- that colloquy down so he can make a written transcript. One of the things which we have to do which I often violate -- and you already have -- is allowing each other to finish --</p>
<p>3</p> <p>1 Ann Arbor, Michigan</p> <p>2 June 21, 2005</p> <p>3 At or about 9:35 a.m.</p> <p>4 ***</p> <p>5 STEVE WILLIAM FULLER, PH.D.,</p> <p>6 having first been duly sworn or affirmed by the Notary Public,</p> <p>7 was examined and testified as follows:</p> <p>8 EXAMINATION</p> <p>9 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD:</p> <p>10 Q Good morning, Dr. Fuller.</p> <p>11 A Good morning.</p> <p>12 Q I've introduced myself off the record, but let me do it on the record. My name is Eric Rothschild. I'm from the law firm of Pepper Hamilton, LLP, and I represent the plaintiff in the lawsuit captioned Kitzmiller, et al., versus Dover Area School District and the Dover school board. And your deposition is being taken in that matter. Do you understand that?</p> <p>13 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. How would you like me to address you in this proceeding?</p> <p>15 A Is there a standard format?</p> <p>16 MR. GILLEN: Whatever you're comfortable with.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: You can call me Steve.</p> <p>18 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p>	<p>5</p> <p>1 A Oh, right. Oh, sorry.</p> <p>2 Q Obviously, in ordinary conversation, we have the habit of interrupting each other all the time, particularly when we think we know where the conversation is going. But that's going to make things very difficult for Bob, and we won't have a very clear record. So please, let me finish my questions before you respond. I will endeavor to do the same for you. And if at any time I've cut off your answer, please let me know, okay? Another thing that we have to keep in mind is because we're trying to create a written record, we have to answer in -- you have to answer in words, so that --</p> <p>3 A Yes. No nodding.</p> <p>4 Q So your response will be clear. This is not an endurance test. At any time if you need to take a break just to clear your head, use the facilities, talk to Mr. Gillen, please let me know and I'm happy to do that. I may initiate some breaks myself, okay?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q Am I -- do I understand correctly that you are represented by counsel at this deposition?</p> <p>7 A Yes?</p> <p>8 MR. GILLEN: Yeah.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>10 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>11 Q And that's Mr. Gillen?</p>

2 (Pages 2 to 2)

<p>6</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Did you meet with Mr. Gillen to prepare for this</p> <p>3 deposition?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And when did you do that?</p> <p>6 A Well, in person, last night and this morning.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. For how many hours did you meet with him?</p> <p>8 A Oh, maybe three. Three maybe.</p> <p>9 Q Did you look at any documents to prepare for the deposition?</p> <p>10 A I did look at the expert reports on the other side. I</p> <p>11 believe I've looked at six of those.</p> <p>12 Q And did you do that in order to prepare for your deposition?</p> <p>13 A I did that to write the rebuttal statement.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. Did you ever read any of the expert reports, other</p> <p>15 expert reports for defendants, your side of the case?</p> <p>16 A I was given a copy of Stephen Meyer's, which I received maybe</p> <p>17 a week ago.</p> <p>18 Q Okay.</p> <p>19 A I haven't seen any of the others.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Did you read Mr. Meyer's - Dr. Meyer's -</p> <p>21 A Yes, yes.</p> <p>22 Q - report?</p> <p>23 A Yes, I have.</p> <p>24 Q And please let me try and finish my -</p> <p>25 A I'm sorry.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>1 Q Okay. When you refer to a he, who is that?</p> <p>2 A Mr. Gillen.</p> <p>3 Q And when you first were contacted, was it your understanding</p> <p>4 you would be preparing a rebuttal expert report as you have,</p> <p>5 or sort of an affirmative or initial expert report?</p> <p>6 A I didn't know one way or the other.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. When did you come to the understanding that you would</p> <p>8 be providing a rebuttal report only?</p> <p>9 A Oh, as soon as - this was part of the agreement. As soon as</p> <p>10 I agreed to be on-board, he made it very clear what I was</p> <p>11 going to be asked to do. And then all these reports were</p> <p>12 being sent, were sent to me quite soon afterwards.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Prior to these contacts that you recall happening in</p> <p>14 February, had you had any contact with the Thomas More Law</p> <p>15 Center?</p> <p>16 A I'd never heard of it.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Prior to your involvement in this case, did you have</p> <p>18 any affiliation or relationship with the Discovery Institute?</p> <p>19 A No. No.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Have you ever had any contacts with the Discovery</p> <p>21 Institute?</p> <p>22 A Not as far as I know.</p> <p>23 Q Okay.</p> <p>24 A Though there may be people who are members of it who didn't</p> <p>25 reveal this fact to me. I --</p>
<p>7</p> <p>1 Q - question. Are you being paid as an expert witness?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And that's in the rate of \$100 per hour?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Who is paying that compensation?</p> <p>6 A I guess you are.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. And when you say you, the Thomas More Law Center?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q When were you retained to be an expert?</p> <p>10 A Can I consult with him on this?</p> <p>11 Q Why don't you give me your memory and -</p> <p>12 MR. GILLEN: Yeah.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. Well, I believe I was first</p> <p>14 contacted maybe toward the end of February. And then</p> <p>15 certainly within a few weeks, I was already on-board. We</p> <p>16 spoke on the phone a couple of times at great length about</p> <p>17 this.</p> <p>18 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>19 Q Okay. When you were first contacted in February, what were</p> <p>20 you asked to do?</p> <p>21 A I was asked - I was just told about the case which I had</p> <p>22 already heard of because it was widely reported in the</p> <p>23 British press. And he was sort of scoping out what his</p> <p>24 position was going to be and whether I would have anything to</p> <p>25 offer to that. And I volunteered my services at that point.</p>	<p>9</p> <p>1 Q Okay. You have an understanding of what the Discovery</p> <p>2 Institute is?</p> <p>3 A Yes, yes, I do.</p> <p>4 Q And what is that?</p> <p>5 A Well, I guess it's what, the leading Intelligent Design think</p> <p>6 tank in the United States. It's located in Seattle.</p> <p>7 Q When did you first become aware of the Discovery Institute?</p> <p>8 A Well, it publicizes its activities quite a lot. And various</p> <p>9 notables from the Intelligent Design movement have made</p> <p>10 reference to it and so forth. And so it's kind of like a</p> <p>11 mecca for that, I would say. And I think it may even have</p> <p>12 had a prior existence as a general thing for bringing</p> <p>13 together science and religion before it became so clearly</p> <p>14 identified with Intelligent Design.</p> <p>15 Q So is it fair to say that you've known about them for a</p> <p>16 number years?</p> <p>17 A Yes, yeah.</p> <p>18 Q I understand you teach at Warwick College or University?</p> <p>19 A University. And it's pronounced Warwick. The W is silent.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. So W-a-r, wick?</p> <p>21 A Yeah. Just like Greenwich, in Connecticut. Sort of the same</p> <p>22 idea.</p> <p>23 Q Oh, okay. Warwick College?</p> <p>24 A University.</p> <p>25 Q University, I apologize. What department do you teach in?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">10</p> <p>1 A Sociology.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Is there also a science department at Warwick?</p> <p>3 A There's not a science department but there's a science</p> <p>4 faculty, which has several -- you know, the normal array of</p> <p>5 sciences in them.</p> <p>6 Q And are they part of a particular department or school?</p> <p>7 A Well, we're organized in a way that's not dissimilar from</p> <p>8 American universities where we have faculties of, you know,</p> <p>9 arts, social sciences and natural sciences. And sociology is</p> <p>10 sort of the flagship discipline in the social science</p> <p>11 faculty, but there is a natural science faculty which has, I</p> <p>12 guess what you'd be referring to as sciences.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And when you talk about natural sciences, that</p> <p>14 includes biology, chemistry, physics?</p> <p>15 A Yes, it does.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. Is Intelligent Design taught -- to your knowledge, is</p> <p>17 it taught in any classes at Warwick?</p> <p>18 A Philosophy.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. Do you teach anything about Intelligent Design in any</p> <p>20 of your classes?</p> <p>21 A I have.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And which classes do you teach it?</p> <p>23 A Well, we have a master's program in philosophy and social</p> <p>24 theory which is co-taught with the philosophy department.</p> <p>25 And there we look at issues of science and religion and how</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>1 A My understanding is they've been sort of open-minded. I</p> <p>2 guess that would be the way to put it.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Your specialty in the social sciences is social</p> <p>4 epistemology?</p> <p>5 A It's kind of a field I founded in a way.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Can you explain to me what that is.</p> <p>7 A Okay. It's -- well, first of all, it's a field that has both</p> <p>8 empirical and normative dimensions. So I'm concerned not</p> <p>9 only with knowledge as it actually is in terms of</p> <p>10 historically and socially how it's developed, but also with</p> <p>11 policy issues about things like how universities should be</p> <p>12 organized, what should research policy be, what sorts of</p> <p>13 things should be taught in school. So it has this kind of</p> <p>14 normative dimension as well. And it tries to bring together</p> <p>15 stuff from the humanities and social sciences that</p> <p>16 traditionally have been sort of operating quite -- in quite</p> <p>17 different fields, in quite different ways, talking about</p> <p>18 rather similar matters. And so I try to bring it all</p> <p>19 together as a kind of synthetic field. And I founded a</p> <p>20 journal by that name in 1987, it's the title of my first</p> <p>21 book. And I guess I'm the person most closely associated</p> <p>22 with it, though there are people throughout the world who</p> <p>23 associate with it as well. And if you were to do a Google</p> <p>24 search, you'd see there's some courses taught in it and stuff</p> <p>25 like that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">11</p> <p>1 it -- and in particular how one explains religious belief and</p> <p>2 stuff of that kind.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. To your knowledge, is Intelligent Design taught in any</p> <p>4 of the natural science courses?</p> <p>5 A I can say this. That it has been discussed, especially this</p> <p>6 sort of mathematical side, the Dembski side has been</p> <p>7 discussed in the mathematics and statistics department.</p> <p>8 Q Do you consider mathematics and statistics part of the</p> <p>9 natural sciences?</p> <p>10 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>11 Q Are you aware of whether Intelligent Design is taught in, for</p> <p>12 example, biology class, any of the biology classes?</p> <p>13 A I don't believe it is.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. And how do you know that Mr. Dembski's, and that's</p> <p>15 D-e-m-b-s-k-i, Mr. Dembski's work has been discussed in</p> <p>16 mathematics or statistics classes?</p> <p>17 A Well, because sometimes there would be these notifications</p> <p>18 about general talks on campus by, you know, professors of</p> <p>19 mathematics or statistics because we have kind of an implied</p> <p>20 mathematics department. So this would be kind of a natural</p> <p>21 popular topic to sort of go into. And so would be through</p> <p>22 that, through publicity. But I have not attended the talks</p> <p>23 on the matter.</p> <p>24 Q Do you know whether the individuals who have taught about</p> <p>25 Mr. Dembski's work have been supportive or critical?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">13</p> <p>1 Q You described some of the background and some of the</p> <p>2 disciplines that social epistemology brings in. But I was</p> <p>3 going to ask you, define social epistemology, or finish the</p> <p>4 sentence, social epistemology is, how would you do that?</p> <p>5 A Okay. It's the empirical and normative study of the social</p> <p>6 foundations of knowledge.</p> <p>7 Q Empirical and normative --</p> <p>8 A Study of the foundations of knowledge, of the social</p> <p>9 foundations of knowledge.</p> <p>10 Q When you're using the word normative, what do you mean?</p> <p>11 A I mean -- I mean talking about things how they ought to be</p> <p>12 sort of from a policy perspective.</p> <p>13 Q And when you use the word empirical in this sense, what do</p> <p>14 you mean?</p> <p>15 A Studying things as they are. Right. So historically or</p> <p>16 sociologically. So it has both dimensions.</p> <p>17 Q Steve, you're doing something that I often do as well which</p> <p>18 is speak very quickly.</p> <p>19 A Oh, sorry.</p> <p>20 Q And for the court reporter, it'd probably be easier if you</p> <p>21 can just slow down a little bit, and I'll try to do the same.</p> <p>22 How does the subject of scientific knowledge fit into your</p> <p>23 the discipline you founded of social -- of social</p> <p>24 epistemology?</p> <p>25 A It's probably the main thing I talk about. I'm primarily</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">14</p> <p>1 concerned with organized forms of knowledge that have a large 2 amount of social legitimacy. And so the kinds of things that 3 we normally call science become very central to that 4 understanding.</p> <p>5 Q And given your work in this area of social epistemology as it 6 applies to sciences -- to science, have you arrived at any 7 conclusions about the nature of scientific knowledge?</p> <p>8 A Well, yes. I mean, some of them, I think, are fairly 9 obvious. Namely that science changes over time. For 10 something to be called a science it has to be 11 universalizable. That's to say it has to be more than just 12 specialty pursued by a restricted group of people for very 13 specific ends. So it has to be more than a cult. It has to 14 be something that in a way could be spread and disseminated 15 throughout the world ideally. Science also tends to be 16 something that tends to break down traditional social 17 barriers. So it tends to be critical of taken for granted 18 notions. So in that respect, science often exists 19 oppositionally with established authority. Science tends to 20 also be progressive in its outlook, and putting forward new 21 possibilities for the way people can be and act in the world. 22 I mean, those are sort of the general kinds of things. 23 And there is a tendency for things that previously were not 24 science and let's say were traditional forms of knowledge, or 25 common sense, or even cult issues to become scientific by</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>1 causes of religious wars in Europe, and turned them into 2 something that can be debated in fairly restricted terms.</p> <p>3 So in terms of experimentation, in terms of mathematical 4 formulation, the kinds of things that we associate these days 5 with the natural sciences. And that's often seen as kind of 6 an iconic event in the beginning of the transition from 7 metaphysics to science. And that sort of thing does seem -- 8 that is quite characteristic, you might say, of the way in 9 which knowledge develops. It does start with these kind of 10 broader, more metaphysically inclined things, and then moved 11 into these more rigorous, more specialized kinds of forms.</p> <p>12 Q And I think I know what you mean. But could you just define 13 how you're using the word metaphysics or metaphysically here.</p> <p>14 A Okay. I mean a sort of totalizing world view that people 15 sort of believe on faith and where there's no clear criteria 16 of instability. Kind of like you're either a believer or 17 you're not. And this is why it would be the source of wars, 18 right, because in the sense of if you don't believe in my 19 god, or you don't believe in my scheme of things, then you 20 don't deserve to exist, right? Where there's a sense in 21 which the ideas are so closely associated with the people, 22 right, that, you know, you've got to get rid of the people in 23 order to get rid of the ideas. Whereas in science, you know, 24 through methods of experimentation and testing, we can get 25 rid of the ideas and still keep the people alive.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>1 certain kinds of means of institutionalization which we often 2 associate with the rise of methodology and stuff like that. 3 I mean, those are just a few things that --</p> <p>4 Q Can you explain what you meant -- mean by that last 5 conclusion that things that were not considered science 6 before become institutionalized by virtue of methodology?</p> <p>7 A Well, I mean, if you were to look at the history of science 8 in the west, let's say, all the basic ideas originated as 9 kind of metaphysical notions, and were pursued pretty much 10 as, you know, as something along the status of, you know, 11 sort of like a world view or something. But then over time, 12 a group of people would get together and try to 13 institutionalize a more rigorous way of discussing and 14 testing the kinds of claims associated with this metaphysics. 15 And this then turns out to be where it becomes scientific. 16 So it sort of makes a sort of transition from being a 17 metaphysics to it being something that's methodologically 18 testable. And you do typically need special institutions for 19 that, so that in the history of the west, something like the 20 Royal Society in London, which is a very -- which is an 21 organization that was basically self-selected in the sense 22 that you had a bunch of people who are interested in natural 23 phenomenon getting together and getting a kind of chartered 24 protected status from the king to take what had been 25 previously metaphysical questions that were actually the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">17</p> <p>1 And this is a very important -- you know, this is a very 2 important moment not only in terms of the history of 3 knowledge, but also in the history of civilization, all 4 right, that we're able to sort of act in this kind of second 5 order fashion where we can, you know, distinguish ourselves 6 from our ideas, and contest the ideas, and still leave the 7 people standing.</p> <p>8 Q And so this transition from metaphysics to what the Royal 9 Society was doing is sort of a differentiation between 10 non-science and science?</p> <p>11 A In a manner speaking, yeah. That would be -- from a 12 sociological standpoint, that's certainly what it looks like.</p> <p>13 Q And again, I'll ask you just to slow down a little bit both 14 so that I can follow and we can get a clear record. Did a 15 transition of this nature occur in the field of biology?</p> <p>16 A Well, not in a straight -- it has in a general kind of way.</p> <p>17 Okay. I -- can I go into some detail in the answer?</p> <p>18 Q Whatever you feel necessary to answer the question. I enjoy 19 learning as well as litigating, so go ahead.</p> <p>20 A Okay. Well, biology as it exists today is actually a very 21 wide array of disciplines, right, ranging from very 22 qualitative approaches like you see in natural ecology where 23 you're basically looking at animals in their native habitat, 24 right, to very sort of quantitative and experimental work 25 which, you know, where one needs to be sort of trained in the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">18</p> <p>1 highest levels of computer simulation and mathematics and all 2 the rest of it. And these fields are really quite different, 3 require quite different expertises. They're credentialed in 4 quite different ways. And the reason why they're all called 5 biology has a lot to do with the fact that they sort of 6 descended from a sort of common conception that really 7 gets -- begins to get crystalized in the beginning of the 8 19th Century when the word biology gets coined. The word 9 biology doesn't really get coined until about 1810 by Lamarck 10 who is one of the early evolutionists.</p> <p>11 And so there is a sense in which the field -- yes. 12 There is something of that process. But it isn't like all 13 the biologists at some point got into a room together and 14 said, okay, you guys, we're going to pull all this stuff out 15 of metaphysics and move into science. It wasn't as 16 straightforward as that. Rather what you had was a gradual 17 distinguishing of biology, and then specialization where each 18 of the specialized fields start to do something like what the 19 Royal Society did for natural philosophy and physics in the 20 17th Century. So the general answer to your question is yes, 21 but not exactly. See, the Royal Society's a good example 22 because it's a very simple example and it's a very old 23 example, where as it were, all the different branches of 24 science are sort of in a sense being conducted together in 25 the same place, separated out from whatever metaphysical or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">20</p> <p>1 is kind of the benchmark for all knowledge until the 17th 2 Century. He has a very unified theory of motion. In other 3 words, physical motion and what we would call biological 4 motion, so organic development, you know, the ways in which 5 animals change, this kind of stuff, was all covered under the 6 same theory. Okay. And it was a theory where, in a sense, 7 all the motion was directed. So even the physical motion, 8 everything had its natural place, right, so it's very 9 teleological in that sense. Well, when you get the 10 scientific revolution with people like Galileo and Newton, 11 the physics part of this gets pulled out. And it gets made 12 to look like pretty much the way we think of physical science 13 today. And the Royal Society is a very important 14 institutional benchmark for establishing that. But this 15 still left all the rest of the stuff, right, that Aristotle 16 was dealing with. And most of that went into biology, okay?</p> <p>17 And that basically has to do the stuff -- has to do with 18 stuff that cannot be reduced to just sort of general physical 19 regularities for whatever it -- at least not <i>prima facie</i>. 20 Okay. And it was in that context that the word biology got 21 coined, the idea being, and this is where they sort of play 22 with the Greek root, that there were sort of internal laws to 23 life that as it were were autonomous from the general 24 physical laws that governed nature more generally. So if you 25 imagine, for example, an organism that's able to retain its</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">19</p> <p>1 religious disputes they can get into. But we're now in a 2 much more complicated situation. And biology's a science 3 that, in a way, has this very kind of heterogeneous line of 4 development. So there is no moment, you might say, where all 5 of biology went from being non-scientific to scientific. 6 It's really different fields happening in different times by 7 different means.</p> <p>8 Q Was there a point in time though that the outcome was it had 9 transitioned from being largely metaphysical to scientific?</p> <p>10 A Well, in the sense that we've been talking about so far with 11 regard to coming up with ways of resolving intellectual 12 disputes, that when they were in their metaphysical form 13 could not be resolved. Yeah, it's true that probably for all 14 these fields, there's now -- and the way you see it is that 15 there are these various, you know, peer reviewed journals and 16 things like that through which these disputes then have to 17 sort of channel themselves in order to be resolved or at 18 least, you know, sort of advanced in certain ways.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. Can you describe for me what -- what form biology 20 took, or the area that biology now covers while it was still 21 in its metaphysical form?</p> <p>22 A Yeah. I think one thing here -- I think the back drop -- 23 okay. Let me start from the very beginning and then move -- 24 I don't want to have to go do the whole history. 25 But if you were to look at somebody like Aristotle who</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">21</p> <p>1 form despite changes in the physical environment, that's the 2 kind of thing biologists were always fascinated by, and still 3 are fascinated by. And it does come up in these kinds of 4 debates that we're talking about here, the deposition, right. 5 Where there's a sense which is there's this physical law out 6 there, it sort of sets these various -- the sort of kind of 7 regular natural force, but nevertheless, there are certain 8 forms that resisted in some way, that managed to survive, 9 that managed to flourish in spite of changes in the physical 10 condition. And this is what biologists were, generally 11 speaking, interested in.</p> <p>12 And so then the question becomes, well, does that mean 13 there's a special life force, some kind of vital principle 14 that governs all this stuff? Or can that stuff itself be 15 reduced to certain kinds of physical laws. Okay. Now, most 16 of biology has gone the latter route, and in different ways, 17 at different points. But there still is this over-arching 18 question about how do organisms manage to retain their form 19 in the face of massive environmental changes very often? 20 Which, you know, and so in that sense, there is still a kind 21 of open question that in a way hasn't been fully reduced from 22 its metaphysical form into science.</p> <p>23 Q Are you familiar with William Paley?</p> <p>24 A Yeah.</p> <p>25 Q Where does he fit on this continuum between metaphysics</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">22</p> <p>1 and -- and sort of, I think what you've characterized</p> <p>2 basically as standard science as we know it?</p> <p>3 A Well, remember, he's writing in the late 18th, early 19th</p> <p>4 Century. And so really, his model of science is someone like</p> <p>5 Newton. And in a sense, he's giving, you might say, a sort</p> <p>6 of -- a sort of metaphysical underpinning to what he believed</p> <p>7 Newton had already established, because Newton himself</p> <p>8 thought he was looking into the mind of God. And basically,</p> <p>9 in presenting the laws of physics, was sort of presenting the</p> <p>10 interface through which God communicated with creation. And</p> <p>11 Paley is basically trying to provide a kind of -- the</p> <p>12 metaphysical principles that make sense of this view, and</p> <p>13 says, look, basically you have to -- if Newton -- if what</p> <p>14 Newton is saying about the universe is correct, that it is</p> <p>15 governed under these limited set of laws and principles, then</p> <p>16 there has to have been some design.</p> <p>17 And then this becomes a kind of indirect argument for</p> <p>18 the existence of God. He's not the first person to invent</p> <p>19 this, by the way. But he is the one to really revive it in</p> <p>20 the context of Newtonianism. So in a sense, it becomes very</p> <p>21 much associated with a kind of modern science argument. It's</p> <p>22 an attempt to, as it were, to keep natural theology in locked</p> <p>23 step with developments in science. So he is -- now, what</p> <p>24 this -- what this means then is it does kind of lend itself</p> <p>25 to the idea that you might be able to think about the laws of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">24</p> <p>1 A Well, that there was an open question as to whether it'd be</p> <p>2 accepted into the journal.</p> <p>3 Q Okay.</p> <p>4 A Right. So somebody else had to read it and make a decision.</p> <p>5 And very often, corrections were involved in actually getting</p> <p>6 the thing into print and so forth.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. So in your field of sociology, is that the general</p> <p>8 process for getting an academic article published?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q And when you talk about refereed in this context, what does</p> <p>11 that process entail?</p> <p>12 A Well, it can vary tremendously. I mean, there's an official</p> <p>13 story and there's a kind of real story. I mean, the official</p> <p>14 story is you look for a person who's an expert in the area</p> <p>15 that the person's written about. And typically, you also</p> <p>16 look for a kind of general reader in the field because in a</p> <p>17 sense, you want articles that are going to be interested to a</p> <p>18 sort of larger constituency than just a specialist. And so</p> <p>19 you at least have two kinds of readers looking at the thing</p> <p>20 to determine whether it's good or not. In practice, you</p> <p>21 often end up going to the people who are willing to do it.</p> <p>22 Refereeing tends to be quite a self-selecting process and</p> <p>23 practice. And because it's time consuming, you're generally</p> <p>24 not paid for doing it, it's a thankless job, actually. And</p> <p>25 it takes away from your own research. So in a sense, we</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">23</p> <p>1 nature in the physical world as kind of an organism created</p> <p>2 by a divine creator, and then imagine that, you know, at a</p> <p>3 kind of lower level, the natural organisms are themselves</p> <p>4 kind of like this, are themselves designed according to a</p> <p>5 plan. So in other words, he was kind of -- he was trying to</p> <p>6 minimize the difference between the Newtonian view and the</p> <p>7 stuff that Newton couldn't explain about the nature of life.</p> <p>8 He was trying to show that in fact this stuff could be put</p> <p>9 under a sort of common unified framework.</p> <p>10 Q In your curriculum vitae, you list on page -- at -- I'm sorry,</p> <p>11 let me mark as Fuller Exhibit 1 your report, if you can reach</p> <p>12 that.</p> <p>13 A Oh, okay.</p> <p>14 (Marked for identification Fuller Deposition Exhibit</p> <p>15 No. 1)</p> <p>16 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>17 Q Do you recognize the document I have marked as Fuller Exhibit</p> <p>18 1?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q What is that?</p> <p>21 A It's a document I wrote, the rebuttal. And it also includes</p> <p>22 my curriculum vitae.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. On page six of your curriculum vitae, you begin a</p> <p>24 multi page list of journal articles, paren, refereed. What</p> <p>25 do you mean by refereed?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">25</p> <p>1 never get referees that are quite as good as what -- what the</p> <p>2 process would seem to suggest. So that's why I say there are</p> <p>3 two different stories. And I speak as someone who's been a</p> <p>4 general editor. And we call ourselves a peer reviewed</p> <p>5 journal as well. But, boy, you know, we often have to rely</p> <p>6 on the same peers.</p> <p>7 Okay. And this can -- we worry it can have a kind of</p> <p>8 effect on the cast of the journal, if you end up having</p> <p>9 certain people refereeing lots of articles, and their biases,</p> <p>10 as it were, comes out, and you have no way of independently</p> <p>11 judging that. Now, if you have a strong editor, an editor</p> <p>12 should -- a strong editor should be able to independently</p> <p>13 judge whether or not the so-called peers have had it in for</p> <p>14 the author. But sometimes that's not the case, and you just</p> <p>15 basically have to fall back on what they say. So there is</p> <p>16 also this element of trust which I personally am a little</p> <p>17 uncomfortable with. But it is an acknowledgment that, you</p> <p>18 know, fields of academic life have become so specialized that</p> <p>19 we're sort of forced to go down this route because, you know,</p> <p>20 people don't want to make fools of themselves in print,</p> <p>21 publishing things that are other rubbish. But it's a very</p> <p>22 imperfect process. And I myself, in one of my books,</p> <p>23 Knowledge Management Foundations, has an appendix -- I have</p> <p>24 an appendix on the peer review process which was based on the</p> <p>25 big global cyberconference I did a couple of years ago on</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">26</p> <p>1 peer review and the social sciences, with all the problems 2 that kind of arise.</p> <p>3 And it's not that the idea of peer review is so bad. 4 It's a good idea in principle. And in fact, when one says 5 what the principle is, it makes perfect sense. But in 6 practice, it's diabolical because there is very little 7 incentive to actually engage in it. And so you end up having 8 just a certain group of people doing it. And so you have to 9 wonder, well, why do they do it? Right. And what's in it 10 for them? And those -- and there are cases, for example, 11 where articles have been peer reviewed, rejected, and then 12 the content of the articles end up getting republished under 13 the author's -- the reviewer's own name, or the reviewer's 14 student or somebody like that. So there are all these 15 potential abuses of the system as well. So I don't want to 16 be seen, even though it's true that this is kind of the 17 principle that, in a sense, we adhere to when we publish 18 stuff, I don't want you to get the impression that we're -- 19 at least that I'm completely satisfied with it. I think 20 there are a lot of problems.</p> <p>21 And I think especially in cases where people are doing 22 stuff that's quite controversial scientifically, you know, 23 where you're threatening kind of taken for granted notions, 24 that this could be really problematic. This could be really 25 problematic. But what is also true is that there -- one has</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">28</p> <p>1 A Well, because it's a minority area in several different 2 fields in which it participates. It's by no means the 3 majority field in any of these sort of established 4 disciplines of science in which we would talk about having 5 departments at universities.</p> <p>6 Q When this peer review -- and let me -- well, let me just back 7 up. We're using the word referee and peer review. Are those 8 basically the same thing in your discipline?</p> <p>9 A Well, if you're engaged in the peer review process, the way 10 it happens is you send an article out to referees, right. 11 The referees are the peer reviewers, right. And they come up 12 with reports which then go to the editor. And the editor 13 somehow takes a judgment on this. Now, how exactly the 14 editor does this is it varies, okay. I mean, some editors 15 don't have any problem with discarding the referee's reports 16 if he or she believes that these have been biased and tainted 17 and all the rest of it. But generally speaking, what the 18 editor does is does some kind of weighting of the respective 19 merits, and then writes back to the author and saying, look, 20 we're accepting or not accepting the article on these 21 grounds, and some aspects of these peer reviewed reports are 22 mentioned to the author as the reasons for it.</p> <p>23 Q And I'm a little unclear of whether this process begins with 24 the submission of an article to a particular journal, or 25 whether the referee process precedes submissions, or how that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">27</p> <p>1 come up with a next best solution to this. So we're sort of 2 stuck with it for the time being. But it is something that 3 has to be closely monitored. And I would say that peer 4 review is most reliable with normal science. In other words 5 standard issue science where it's quite clear from the outset 6 what is this person trying to contribute to, there's already 7 establish body of work in the area, and you can tell in a 8 fairly routine way whether this person's got it right or not, 9 because mostly what you're doing is a competency test then 10 And then you don't have -- and in a sense you figure, well, 11 if this person knows what they're doing, their conclusions 12 follow. But when you're dealing with the fringe areas, where 13 things are kind of controversial, then peer review isn't 14 going to be that effective.</p> <p>15 Q And are -- where does Intelligent Design --</p> <p>16 A Well, in the fringe area -- I mean, I think in the fringe 17 area. I think it's very difficult to peer review 18 intelligence. I can see it pretty obviously from looking at 19 the materials in the area. This would be very difficult 20 stuff to referee because it's really putting together very 21 unusual combinations of things. Okay. And so you're 22 wondering who's the expert here. Right. And that's not 23 clear.</p> <p>24 Q And when you characterize Intelligent Design as a fringe 25 area, why do you do that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">29</p> <p>1 works?</p> <p>2 A Well, let's say you're a scientist, and you write an article, 3 right. And you want it to be published. You will send it to 4 a journal, you know, presumably a peer reviewed journal if 5 you want to get some professional advancement. And then the 6 refereeing process starts then.</p> <p>7 Q All right. And so -- and that's the same for --</p> <p>8 A Oh. But may I make a correction? Sometimes, of course, and 9 this has been true with a lot of -- lot of my writing, you 10 get invited by the journals, okay, to submit stuff, but still 11 it goes through a peer review process. But normally, there's 12 a little more give and take because you wouldn't have been 13 invited if they didn't think you were at least half 14 competent. So that typically there's some negotiation that 15 takes place, right, so that rarely are you rejected outright 16 when you've been invited, but you may have to substantially 17 rewrite what you've done. Whereas with the other process, 18 where you're sending it in cold, you might just be rejected 19 outright.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. When you were retained as an expert by the Thomas More 21 Law Center for the defendants, what were you asked to do?</p> <p>22 A What was I asked to do? Well, I was asked to write a 23 rebuttal to these six guys who are on your side, I guess that 24 was -- that's the most straightforward answer to your 25 question.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">30</p> <p>1 Q Was there any -- were there any more specific instructions or</p> <p>2 agreements about in what respects you would write rebuttal to</p> <p>3 them?</p> <p>4 A Well, I would write rebuttals with regard to my expertise in</p> <p>5 the area. I mean, I made it clear at the outset, for</p> <p>6 example, you know, I'm not familiar with the textbooks that</p> <p>7 are under contention. So I don't talk about those things. I</p> <p>8 don't know about them. But what I do know about is the</p> <p>9 general tenor of the Intelligent Design movement in relation</p> <p>10 to other developments in biology and in history and</p> <p>11 philosophy and sociology of science, and I'm more than -- was</p> <p>12 more than happy to comment on those, and especially after</p> <p>13 reading the reports. Because actually, I mean, I took</p> <p>14 serious objection to a lot of the things that were said. I</p> <p>15 have no problem doing that.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And is there a particular area of expertise that you</p> <p>17 brought to bear on rebutting the plaintiff's expert reports?</p> <p>18 A Yes, I think so. And I think this has to do with the nature</p> <p>19 of science itself. Okay. Because this is something more</p> <p>20 than whether somebody's competent in a particular specialty</p> <p>21 within science. But there's an issue about what is science</p> <p>22 and how one determines that. And that involves knowing</p> <p>23 something about the larger historical, philosophical and</p> <p>24 sociological trends in science by which science gets defined</p> <p>25 and redefined because those are -- it's going to be in that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">32</p> <p>1 for people trained in a particular science, they are trained</p> <p>2 how to do that science, and they do it perfectly well, and</p> <p>3 their competence is fine. I'm not questioning that. But in</p> <p>4 terms of what makes it a science, you know, what makes</p> <p>5 biology a science, what makes chemistry a science, what makes</p> <p>6 physics a science, there's no reason to think that a</p> <p>7 biologist, chemist or physicist has any expertise in that area.</p> <p>8 Q Has your research in the area of social epistemology led you</p> <p>9 to draw any conclusions about how science is practiced today?</p> <p>10 A Yeah, yeah. You want me to tell you them?</p> <p>11 Q Yes.</p> <p>12 A Well, it's just that there are a lot. One thing that I think</p> <p>13 is very important to keep in mind is that science is not</p> <p>14 something whose trajectory and the trajectory of all the</p> <p>15 fields that are called science, they cannot be explained</p> <p>16 purely by internal scientific means. Right. In other words,</p> <p>17 if you want to explain the history of physics, you can't just</p> <p>18 look at what physicists have done. You have to look at the</p> <p>19 external conditions as in various ways, promoting and</p> <p>20 inhibiting various lines of research, okay. And this is true</p> <p>21 of all the other sciences as well. I mean, in a sense, it's</p> <p>22 quite easy to imagine this in the case of social sciences</p> <p>23 because they deal with social things, so you would expect</p> <p>24 these things to be normally -- you know, affected by society.</p> <p>25 But it is no less true of the natural sciences.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">31</p> <p>1 broader perspective that one can then get some perspective</p> <p>2 about whether these newcomers like Intelligent Design really</p> <p>3 fit the bill or not. You know, I mean, you can't just judge</p> <p>4 it in terms of already existing specialties. At least this</p> <p>5 is my view because I'm not a specialist in any of the</p> <p>6 sciences that are under consideration here. And I make that</p> <p>7 clear.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And so if I understand you correctly, what you -- the</p> <p>9 expertise that you bring to bear on this is on the nature or</p> <p>10 definition of science?</p> <p>11 A Yes, which is something that professional scientists are not</p> <p>12 necessarily competent to speak on.</p> <p>13 Q Are there particular disciplines or areas of expert -- of</p> <p>14 education or experience that you think are necessary to weigh</p> <p>15 in on that question?</p> <p>16 A I think you really do need to know something about the</p> <p>17 history, philosophy and sociology of science. And you</p> <p>18 need -- and science understood in terms of the full diversity</p> <p>19 of fields that through history have been called science. You</p> <p>20 really need to have some grounding in that. It is all too</p> <p>21 easy to just generalize from your own specialty, right. Or</p> <p>22 as sometimes as actually has happened in philosophy,</p> <p>23 generalizing through physics, and making it look like all of</p> <p>24 science has always been like that. And so that's -- that's</p> <p>25 the real -- that's the real problem, right. And especially</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">33</p> <p>1 And one of the things, of course, that has happened in</p> <p>2 the 20th Century is that the natural sciences have become</p> <p>3 increasingly involved with government and industry concerns.</p> <p>4 And this had led to development of very large scale</p> <p>5 instruments and large scale research programs involving</p> <p>6 nowadays dozens and sometimes hundreds of people. And so we</p> <p>7 talk about big science, right. A transition from little</p> <p>8 science to big science, where it's quite clear that science</p> <p>9 reaches this kind of size because of the external factors</p> <p>10 that are promoting it, largely because they see themselves as</p> <p>11 beneficiaries. So it's not an accident that nuclear physics</p> <p>12 and the search for sub-atomic particles starts to really gain</p> <p>13 some momentum with the rise of the atomic bomb. That's not</p> <p>14 an accident. They're intimately connected, it's the same</p> <p>15 people involved in them, okay.</p> <p>16 And likewise, if you look at the period we're living in</p> <p>17 now where the biological sciences really have eclipsed the ...</p> <p>18 physical sciences as a sort of dominant areas of research and</p> <p>19 expansion and so forth, we can talk about two things. We can</p> <p>20 talk about the decline of the cold war, which leads to the</p> <p>21 retreat from the physics funding. But on the other hand, we</p> <p>22 can -- this opens up a kind of market for science, right, and</p> <p>23 the market tends to be consumer driven. And so</p> <p>24 pharmaceutical industry, other areas -- biology can be very</p> <p>25 easily turned into something that's niche marketed in various</p>

ways. So you can find a gene for something, and then this can cure people who have that disease. And then you've got a potential for a market opening up. And this explains why in the biological sciences, say, there's what we would call uneven development, right, where in a sense some of the more traditionally naturalistic, and I mean naturalistic like ecologically oriented, parts of biology are kind of starving sometimes because unless they're connected to something like global warming, all right, or the environmental movement, there's not a lot of money around just to study animals in their native habitat. Okay. However, if you happen to be on the sort of molecular biology side of things, there's loads of money around.

And so what this means then is that the way science is developing at the moment which reflects kind of the way in which the market is operating means that science is very messy, very divergent, right? It's not like the way physics was, let's say 50 years ago, where one could talk about, you know, unifying theories and of this. And not surprisingly, during that period when physics was supreme and was sort of unifying all phenomena, there was very strong centralized state funding in physics, and it was very much part of a kind of state effort where the race for science was kind of an analog to the race, you know, to be supreme in the world. The U.S. versus the Soviet Union, I'm thinking of here. But

now that's all changed. And so you end up getting this very kind of variegated picture of science, where there's very little unity going on, and where the scientists really aren't in full control of the research agenda anymore. I mean, there are other factors. I don't want -- I don't know how long you want me to go into this. But there are lots of other factors as well which are really changing the character in which science is pursued. So a lot of the models from, let's say 50 years ago, that were very physics based, don't really apply any longer in the kind of world we live in.

Q I think I recall from earlier this morning, the only expert report of defendants you read was Mr. Meyer's -- Dr. Meyer's?

A Yeah.

Q Was -- did -- was there anything in that report that you disagreed with?

A Disagreed with? Yes, actually. Yeah, yeah. I've got to say, I think the demarcation issue is a more serious issue than he makes it out to be. I mean, if you recall, part of what he wants to say in his report is that -- the philosophical problem of demarcation of science and non-science is kind of a non-question, and that for people like Pennock and others to kind of rely on that so strongly is kind of to miss the way in which the philosophy of science is progressed. My own view about this, which I mention in the rebuttal, without having read Meyer, I hadn't read Meyer

when I wrote the rebuttal, is that basically the demarcation problem is actually quite a significant problem, it does apply in this case but it has to be understood properly. And the problem is that from the time that Michael Rose entered his testimony in the Arkansas case in 1982, there's been a kind of a systematic misunderstanding and even vulgarization of what the demarcation is about. And I think that's kind of carried on into Pennock's report and others as well. And I think Meyer in a sense kind of -- kind of thinks that that is the demarcation problem and wants to avoid it like the plague, not surprisingly. So I found him a little too kind of defensive in that regard. Yeah, I guess that would be the main -- the main kind of objection I would make. I mean, I think that the demarcation issue needs to be revisited, understanding what the point of it was.

Q Okay. And -- and do you have a view on whether there are demarcation criteria that distinguish science from non-science, or from pseudo-science?

A I think, yes, in a general way. I mean, the problem is that they're not robust -- they're not -- they're not -- they're not universalizable or specific enough to satisfy philosophical criteria. And that's why the project was abandoned, because the philosophers couldn't agree amongst themselves on the specifics. But it seems to me the general -- the general understanding is correct. And that

has to do with the issue of testability. So I don't -- so the basic point that everybody always points to with regard to demarcation criteria is correct. Namely, it's testability, and where testability is understood in a way that echoes back to one of the answers to the earlier questions; namely, a conversion of what might be seen as metaphysical issues into something that's methodologically tractable, right.

Where you could figure out criteria by which you could decide whether a theory is, you know, improving itself, getting closer to its own goals, whether it's taking evidence seriously, and in that sense, making that transition from metaphysics to science, right. And yes, that's what the demarcation issue is about. Does an activity display that kind of pattern? That's basically the question that one has to pose to demarcate science from non-science. Because one could easily imagine a metaphysical position just entrenched itself over time, and then when people make objections -- right, it doesn't become more specific, it doesn't become more precise, it doesn't shift its means of defense. But what it does instead is just to repeat itself.

Q So am I correct in understanding then that you look at testability as a criteria that one can use to distinguish science from non-science?

A I believe, yeah, if understood properly, that is possible

<p>38</p> <p>1 Q Possible, or that is correct? I mean, is that a criteria</p> <p>2 that you would use to say, all right, this field of inquiry</p> <p>3 is scientific and this field of inquiry is not scientific?</p> <p>4 A Yeah. But see, the key point here --</p> <p>5 Q Can I -- you said yeah, and I want to -- that -- is that a</p> <p>6 yes or a no?</p> <p>7 A Well, I want to clarify what my answer is here, okay?</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Fine.</p> <p>9 A It -- is it -- as long as you understand this as a dynamic</p> <p>10 process, so in other words, no science, and this applies no</p> <p>11 less to evolution than to Intelligent Design, can make its</p> <p>12 claims testable, all of its key claims testable at any given</p> <p>13 moment in time, right? I mean, what we're looking for is</p> <p>14 whether the research trajectory, the way in which the</p> <p>15 research has been developing over the course of its lifespan,</p> <p>16 whether it shows a tendency toward making more of its claims</p> <p>17 testable. That is what we're looking at here, okay? So, for</p> <p>18 example, I don't think any evolutionist would claim that all</p> <p>19 evolutionary claims are testable. But one can say there's</p> <p>20 been some improvement since the beginning of the 20th</p> <p>21 Century. And I think the same can be said of Intelligent</p> <p>22 Design.</p> <p>23 Q So just to back up for a minute, if you were looking at an</p> <p>24 area of science -- of inquiry and trying to determine whether</p> <p>25 you considered it scientific, what you would look at is</p>	<p>40</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And -- and by the way, have you ever spoken to</p> <p>2 Dr. Meyer about Intelligent Design?</p> <p>3 A No, no. In fact, it only dawned on me once I got retained</p> <p>4 that in fact that there is -- I have an essay that appears in</p> <p>5 a volume that he co-edited. And because I was in contact</p> <p>6 with the other editor, John Angus Campbell, I hadn't realized</p> <p>7 that Meyer was actually on-board with this, because my essay</p> <p>8 is actually one that was originally published in a journal</p> <p>9 which Meyer had nothing to do with. So, no, I had no contact</p> <p>10 with Meyer.</p> <p>11 Q And you anticipated my next question. You do have some</p> <p>12 relationship to Dr. Campbell?</p> <p>13 A Yes, I do know Campbell, for many years.</p> <p>14 Q And have you spoken to him about Intelligent Design?</p> <p>15 A I don't think so. I don't think so, I mean, he -- you know,</p> <p>16 if you mean it literally, like has he and I ever had a</p> <p>17 conversation about Intelligent Design, the answer is no.</p> <p>18 Q And are you aware that he has withdrawn from the case?</p> <p>19 A I didn't even know he was on the case.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. He was. He's not. Now you know. Are you familiar</p> <p>21 with William Dembski?</p> <p>22 A Oh, yes.</p> <p>23 Q And have you read any of Dr. Dembski's work on Intelligent</p> <p>24 Design?</p> <p>25 A Yes. Yes, indeed. And I've read some of the responses to it</p>
<p>39</p> <p>1 whether the research trajectory is making more of its claims</p> <p>2 testable?</p> <p>3 MR. GILLEN: Objection to the form.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: That's -- what?</p> <p>5 MR. ROTHSCILD: You can answer.</p> <p>6 MR. GILLEN: Go ahead, you can answer.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Yeah. That's -- that's right. That's</p> <p>8 right. And the thing is so it does require that you know</p> <p>9 history of the program. You have to have -- you have to have</p> <p>10 kind of an accurate understanding of the history of the</p> <p>11 program. You cannot -- I mean, one of the key philosophers</p> <p>12 of science of the last 50 years who Meyer actually cites,</p> <p>13 Imre Lakatos, L-a-k-a-t-o-s, he was very much an opponent of</p> <p>14 what you might call instant rationality, where in a sense you</p> <p>15 can do a snapshot of a science at a given point in time and</p> <p>16 say, well, are the claims testable? Yes? No? Science, not</p> <p>17 science. That's not how you judge it. You have to look at</p> <p>18 the history. You have to kind of get a sense of the</p> <p>19 trajectory, where it's going with what it's doing. Not just</p> <p>20 at one moment in time because at any given moment in time, no</p> <p>21 theory is going to look perfect. Even the best theory is</p> <p>22 going to have a lot of its major claims untestable.</p> <p>23 BY MR. ROTHSCILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>24 Q Are you aware that Dr. Meyer has withdrawn from this case?</p> <p>25 A Yes, I am.</p>	<p>41</p> <p>1 as well. And I've heard him speak many, many years ago.</p> <p>2 Before he became famous.</p> <p>3 Q Before he became famous?</p> <p>4 A Yeah, yeah.</p> <p>5 Q Are you aware that he was retained as an expert in this case?</p> <p>6 A I can't -- maybe Pat did say this. I don't recall right this</p> <p>7 minute.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And I would take it then you're not aware that he's</p> <p>9 also withdrawn from the case?</p> <p>10 A No, I didn't know that.</p> <p>11 Q No?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. In -- have you ever spoken to anybody from the Dover</p> <p>14 community about the facts relating to this case?</p> <p>15 A I don't even know where Dover is.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. Eventually you may have to visit?</p> <p>17 A I know, I understand.</p> <p>18 Q Have you read any of the depositions taken in this case of</p> <p>19 people from Dover or experts?</p> <p>20 A Well, no. I haven't read the depositions, no.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. What -- were you provided any documents to assist you</p> <p>22 in the preparation of your report?</p> <p>23 A Well, the -- the expert reports that you -- for your side.</p> <p>24 Those.</p> <p>25 Q Right. Anything else?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">42</p> <p>1 A I also was provided some of the initial -- statement of the</p> <p>2 actual Complaint that was filed.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And what about the answer to the Complaint, did you</p> <p>4 receive that?</p> <p>5 A I don't know. I don't know.</p> <p>6 Q Okay.</p> <p>7 A I mean, I really have focused my attention on rebutting your</p> <p>8 experts.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. And I understand from your report you have not</p> <p>10 reviewed any textbooks being used in the --</p> <p>11 A That's correct.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Do you have an understanding about how Intelligent</p> <p>13 Design is being presented to students at Dover?</p> <p>14 A Not specifically. I can vaguely imagine, but I don't have</p> <p>15 any specific knowledge.</p> <p>16 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Okay. Why don't we take a short break</p> <p>17 MR. GILLEN: Certainly.</p> <p>18 (A brief recess taken at 10:26 a.m.)</p> <p>19 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Back on the record.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I was told about Dembski. I had confused</p> <p>21 him with Behe. But I was told about Dembski's withdrawal.</p> <p>22 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>23 Q Do you know anything about Behe? Withdrawn. So you are</p> <p>24 aware of Dr. Dembski's withdraw?</p> <p>25 A Yes. I had confused the two in my mind because I knew one of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <p>1 why I didn't buy the book. But so I have read a couple of</p> <p>2 chapters from it, you might say.</p> <p>3 Q And do you recall, is that the Design Inference that --</p> <p>4 A Yeah.</p> <p>5 Q So you've read portions of that book and articles that are --</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q -- drawn from that book, or were the subject, the content of</p> <p>8 that book?</p> <p>9 A Yes, indeed.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. Other than that, have you read any of Dr. Dembski's</p> <p>11 work?</p> <p>12 A I dipped into some other things, but I haven't -- I'm not</p> <p>13 like a student of Dembski or something.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. And have you read anything written by Dr. Behe?</p> <p>15 A Yeah, yeah. Darwin's Black Box. Yeah.</p> <p>16 Q All the way through?</p> <p>17 A No, same sort of deal, because this stuff has been also</p> <p>18 couple of chapters have been published in other places. I do</p> <p>19 own a copy of the book.</p> <p>20 Q And I'm just trying to get an understanding of sort of how</p> <p>21 much you've familiarized yourself with Dr. Dembski or</p> <p>22 Dr. Behe's work. Let's use Behe as an example. Can you</p> <p>23 explain to me sort of, you know, what you've read and sort</p> <p>24 how you selected within the book to decide what to read?</p> <p>25 A Well, first of all, I first found out about both of them</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">43</p> <p>1 them had gone, and that's why I was consulting with --</p> <p>2 Q Okay. When I asked you before whether you had read any of</p> <p>3 the work of Dr. Dembski, was there any confusion there?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q You have read it?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q You have read Dr. Dembski's work. And can you describe what</p> <p>8 of his work you have read?</p> <p>9 A Well, let's see. That main book of his that he published</p> <p>10 with Cambridge now about five years ago, Detecting Design, I</p> <p>11 believe. I forgot what the exact title of it is. But the</p> <p>12 one that in fact has been subject to a lot of philosophical</p> <p>13 discussion which tries to come up with the explanatory filter</p> <p>14 notion of design.</p> <p>15 Q Okay.</p> <p>16 A That's the main work of his I've read. I think that is in</p> <p>17 fact the main work of his in a sense.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. And when you read it, did you read it all the way</p> <p>19 through?</p> <p>20 A No.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. What did you read from it?</p> <p>22 A Well, I dipped into it. And I also -- there were some</p> <p>23 articles that he had published that were taken from the book</p> <p>24 which I had read as well. And I realized that they were sort</p> <p>25 of -- they came from there. And that's one reason, perhaps,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">45</p> <p>1 actually through articles that they published often in</p> <p>2 magazines, sort of relatively high profile, general</p> <p>3 intellectual forms. And then I would go and look at the</p> <p>4 books. And then once there started to be some especially</p> <p>5 philosophical discussion about their work, I went back and</p> <p>6 sort of looked at the books a little more deeply.</p> <p>7 Q And, I mean, what do you mean by -- I mean, you know, I have</p> <p>8 a book in front of me, and I can flip through the pages, I</p> <p>9 can --</p> <p>10 A Well, in the case of -- in the case of Behe, I was looking</p> <p>11 through some of his work because I wanted to select a section</p> <p>12 to put in a -- in a kind of a teach -- some teaching</p> <p>13 materials that I prepared for the Open University called, Are</p> <p>14 Science and Religion Compatible? And so I had to go through</p> <p>15 and see what would be tractable for students. So I was kind</p> <p>16 of reading with that kind of eye. In the case of Dembski, I</p> <p>17 actually got quite interested in the way in which</p> <p>18 philosophers were taking it increasingly seriously, because</p> <p>19 for me, that sort of indicated quite a change in the way in</p> <p>20 which Intelligent Design was being perceived, because I</p> <p>21 remembered from the Arkansas case 20 years ago, philosophers</p> <p>22 would not have given the degree of care in the reading of his</p> <p>23 work that they are doing now. And that struck me. And that</p> <p>24 led me to sort of look at what had been going on. So in a</p> <p>25 sense, the responses to the work have kind of led me to look</p>

<p>46</p> <p>1 at it more.</p> <p>2 Q We talked about sciences transitioning -- or knowledge</p> <p>3 transitioning from metaphysics to science, correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Using that framework, is Intelligent Design science?</p> <p>6 A It's certainly moving in that direction, yes.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Is it science?</p> <p>8 A Well, again, if we're using this dynamic criteria of</p> <p>9 testability whereby over time claims that were previously</p> <p>10 metaphysical are being put in a more scientifically tractable</p> <p>11 form, the answer is yes.</p> <p>12 Q You agree that physics is science?</p> <p>13 A For the time being, yes.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. Still up for debate?</p> <p>15 A Well, anything's up for debate. I mean, the point is -- but</p> <p>16 no, the way it conducts itself is clearly science. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Same with chemistry?</p> <p>18 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>19 Q That's a yes?</p> <p>20 A Yes, yes. Sorry, yes.</p> <p>21 Q That's all right. Evolutionary biology?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Biochemistry?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. Is Intelligent Design science in the same way that</p>	<p>48</p> <p>1 correct. I certainly wasn't trained as a biologist either.</p> <p>2 Q And what was the last biology course you took?</p> <p>3 A I taught -- took one in university at Columbia.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. As an undergraduate?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And is that true of generally the natural science subjects</p> <p>7 like chemistry and physics and biology?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. All your, what I'll call hard sciences took place as</p> <p>10 an undergraduate?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Or -- or prior?</p> <p>13 A Or even younger, yes. I think you'll see that's also</p> <p>14 characteristic of a lot of people in my field.</p> <p>15 Q Sure. I take it you don't hold yourself out as an expert in</p> <p>16 biochemistry?</p> <p>17 A No.</p> <p>18 Q Molecular biology?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q Paleontology?</p> <p>21 A No, but I don't think that's particularly unusual.</p> <p>22 Q Not being critical. Just wanted to sort of make sure the</p> <p>23 record is clear.</p> <p>24 A So do I.</p> <p>25 Q I don't hold myself out as an expert in paleontology either.</p>
<p>47</p> <p>1 those areas are science?</p> <p>2 A Yes, except that it's at an earlier stage of its development.</p> <p>3 Q Give me a comparison relative to chemistry as where is</p> <p>4 Intelligent Design in its stage of development relative to</p> <p>5 where chemistry is?</p> <p>6 A Oh, probably when Lavoisier and Dalton were writing, late</p> <p>7 18th, early 19th Century, where you start to get a conception</p> <p>8 that matter is made of atoms or fundamental elements, and</p> <p>9 there's some sketching out of what those elements might be</p> <p>10 and how they might combine. And you're getting also the</p> <p>11 sketches of some laws, but you still don't have anything like</p> <p>12 a periodic table, and you don't have kind of the full,</p> <p>13 systematic presentation of organic and inorganic chemistry</p> <p>14 and all that kind of stuff that you get later in the 19th</p> <p>15 Century. So I would say that. I mean, that's where I would</p> <p>16 put it. So it's relatively -- relatively young.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. We talked about the expertise you bring to this case.</p> <p>18 And I'm just going to confirm some areas where I think you</p> <p>19 would agree you don't have expertise. You're not an expert</p> <p>20 in the science of biology, is that correct?</p> <p>21 A Not -- not in the conventional sense. That's for sure. I</p> <p>22 mean, I couldn't do a biology experiment. I probably would</p> <p>23 be very hard pressed to publish in a peer reviewed journal in</p> <p>24 biological sciences unless it was a very general one perhaps.</p> <p>25 So I guess, yes, if that's your definition, that's probably</p>	<p>49</p> <p>1 Pat is because he took a paleontology deposition.</p> <p>2 MR. GILLFN: I wish that qualified me.</p> <p>3 BY MR. ROTHSCCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>4 Q Do you hold yourself out as an expert in genetics?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q How about gene sequence comparison?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q How about information theory?</p> <p>9 A No, though I have been a professor at a school of library and</p> <p>10 information science where such things are discussed. So some</p> <p>11 such people might listen to me. But I am not -- I don't</p> <p>12 consider myself an expert in the area.</p> <p>13 Q What about mathematics?</p> <p>14 A No.</p> <p>15 Q Statistics?</p> <p>16 A No. Though I have taught it. Yeah, elementary. It's</p> <p>17 part -- I -- since I'm a -- my Ph.D. was in history and</p> <p>18 philosophy of science, that is the kind of thing that one</p> <p>19 would teach to undergraduates to -- you know, as part of</p> <p>20 the -- as part of your teaching assistant jobs.</p> <p>21 Q What about do you hold yourself out as an expert in the</p> <p>22 subject of education for secondary school students?</p> <p>23 A No.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. Have you taken any classes in education?</p> <p>25 A No.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">50</p> <p>1 Q Have you taught any classes in education?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q What have you taught?</p> <p>4 A Well, I've taught a cross-listed class at UCLA between</p> <p>5 library and information science and education.</p> <p>6 Q And what was the subject matter of that class?</p> <p>7 A It was on my own -- my own work on social epistemology which</p> <p>8 has some credibility in these areas.</p> <p>9 Q Do you consider yourself an expert in Intelligent Design?</p> <p>10 A An expert in Intelligent Design. No.</p> <p>11 Q Okay.</p> <p>12 A I'm an expert on the nature of science.</p> <p>13 Q Gotcha. Okay. Do you consider -- do you consider</p> <p>14 yourself -- you said that Intelligent Design is science. I</p> <p>15 think -- I think we can agree, you're basically saying it's</p> <p>16 science but not as far along as some of the other natural</p> <p>17 sciences?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. Do you consider yourself an expert on the scientific</p> <p>20 content of Intelligent Design?</p> <p>21 A I'm not sure what you mean by that.</p> <p>22 Q Well, let me ask you, let me ask you, what is Intelligent</p> <p>23 Design?</p> <p>24 A What is Intelligent Design? Well, it's an attempt to explain</p> <p>25 actually a vast array of phenomena, not just restricted to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">52</p> <p>1 understanding the nature of life, that's sort of an extension</p> <p>2 of the idea, because I think we have no problem with</p> <p>3 Intelligent Design with regard to artifacts.</p> <p>4 Q And why do you say that?</p> <p>5 A Because humans are the intelligents who are designing the</p> <p>6 things. I mean, we know where it comes from. We actually</p> <p>7 know the causal process in terms of how these things are</p> <p>8 produced.</p> <p>9 Q And how do you understand we come to that knowledge with</p> <p>10 artifacts?</p> <p>11 A How do we come to that knowledge? Well, largely because we</p> <p>12 could do it ourselves. Right. We can actually produce</p> <p>13 these -- we can say -- I can say, look, I'm going to design a</p> <p>14 car. I'm doing it, it's done. Here's the car. And you can</p> <p>15 sort of lay out the steps by which it happens. You can talk</p> <p>16 about the general blueprint, how the blueprint's supplied</p> <p>17 materially to make the thing run and then it works. And so</p> <p>18 you have a complete sense of that causal process there. And</p> <p>19 so that's the kind of paradigm case I would say of</p> <p>20 Intelligent Design.</p> <p>21 Q And am I correct in understanding your testimony from a</p> <p>22 couple minutes ago that that kind of design inference, so to</p> <p>23 speak, is the model for the design inference being used for</p> <p>24 biological life?</p> <p>25 A Yeah, I would say so. I would say that's ultimately what's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">51</p> <p>1 the origins of life, in terms of some kind of design that was</p> <p>2 put there deliberately. Now, the scope of the theory -- the</p> <p>3 scope of this science is potentially quite large. In that</p> <p>4 respect, it's very much like information science, that in a</p> <p>5 way, doesn't have to be restricted to a single domain. So</p> <p>6 it's just not about life. It could be about anything that</p> <p>7 displays this design pattern because machines, obviously,</p> <p>8 have Intelligent Design, right, and they're not forms of</p> <p>9 life. So it is -- in a way, it's kind of almost like a</p> <p>10 second order science, like information theory attempts to be.</p> <p>11 I guess that would be how I would pitch it.</p> <p>12 Q You used -- you know, obviously, the word design is in the</p> <p>13 term Intelligent Design.</p> <p>14 A Yeah, yeah.</p> <p>15 Q What do you mean by design?</p> <p>16 A Well, it's very unlikely that the order that is produced</p> <p>17 would have come about through -- through chance, right, that</p> <p>18 there isn't some cause, some plan there that the order was</p> <p>19 meant to be there. I mean, the model for it is an artifact</p> <p>20 or a machine. Something, obviously, a human has designed. I</p> <p>21 mean, that's -- I mean, in that respect, you know, Paley sets</p> <p>22 a kind of benchmark for what the image of the -- of what the</p> <p>23 science is about. And that's why -- that's the -- sort of</p> <p>24 the natural way to understand this. And then with all the</p> <p>25 stuff that's going on now with Intelligent Design</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">53</p> <p>1 being aimed at. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Here's what I don't understand. And maybe you can help clear</p> <p>3 this up for me. You explained how we understand design of</p> <p>4 human artifacts from the -- and you said, you know, we can</p> <p>5 understand it because we can do it, right? How does that</p> <p>6 provide a model for design of biological life?</p> <p>7 A Well, I think the best way to think about this is in fact</p> <p>8 with what -- imagine computer simulations which, you know,</p> <p>9 are increasingly in the biological sciences when we're trying</p> <p>10 to project backward into how life began, where, you know, we</p> <p>11 have recourse -- we of course have recourse to fossils to a</p> <p>12 certain extent. We can get some sense of what life was like</p> <p>13 in the beginning that way. And we can do some DNA testing on</p> <p>14 that. But increasingly we have to rely on computer</p> <p>15 simulations. And computer simulations are design functions,</p> <p>16 right, where you're programming a system to behave in a</p> <p>17 certain way, and then you see what the outcomes are. And you</p> <p>18 say, well, okay, let's say that I imagine that the world was</p> <p>19 designed with these three or four parameters that interact in</p> <p>20 a certain way according to a computer program I can</p> <p>21 specialize -- specify. Well, that then produced the world as</p> <p>22 we know it. Okay. If it does, right, that's a good argument</p> <p>23 for design, it seems to me. If not, you know, back to the</p> <p>24 drawing board. But the point is we're already doing stuff in</p> <p>25 science where we're actually engaged in design like</p>

<p>54</p> <p>1 activities.</p> <p>2 Okay. So I don't think it's so far-fetched in</p> <p>3 principle, especially in the period in which we're living,</p> <p>4 where we're doing more and more of our science on computer</p> <p>5 programs which requires that the scientist actually design</p> <p>6 the situation in which the phenomenon is going to manifest</p> <p>7 itself. I mean, so I -- I don't see -- I don't see quite the</p> <p>8 problem in principle here.</p> <p>9 Q Well, why would the fact that humans can design a model lead</p> <p>10 us to any conclusions about what a non-human, non-natural</p> <p>11 actor can do in terms of creating some form of biological</p> <p>12 life?</p> <p>13 A Well, just stated that way, sure. You're absolutely right.</p> <p>14 But that's not -- that's not the whole story, right? In</p> <p>15 fact, you know, this is where one -- I mean, the point is</p> <p>16 that even people who don't consider themselves proponents of</p> <p>17 Intelligent Design are in fact, you know, playing around with</p> <p>18 models that, in a sense, put them in the position of</p> <p>19 potential designers of universes. Okay. So in a sense,</p> <p>20 science is moving in a design oriented direction already.</p> <p>21 It's just the people doing it who, let's say, do complexity</p> <p>22 theory and stuff like that don't like to call it Intelligent</p> <p>23 Design. But in a sense, they're adopting the standpoint, you</p> <p>24 know, that would seem to me ultimately Intelligent Design is</p> <p>25 trying to work itself back to. That's why so many of these</p>	<p>56</p> <p>1 A Yeah. I mean Dembski and Behe. That is to say, not the high</p> <p>2 school textbooks.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. So let's just be clear what you mean. And let me ask</p> <p>4 this in a couple of -- a couple questions about this. First</p> <p>5 of all, you said you're not -- you don't hold yourself out as</p> <p>6 an expert in the content, the scientific content of</p> <p>7 Intelligent Design, is that right?</p> <p>8 A We haven't gotten back to what you mean by that yet. Can</p> <p>9 you -- you just throw the question back at me. So what do</p> <p>10 you mean by scientific content?</p> <p>11 Q Well, okay, fair enough. What do you understand to be the</p> <p>12 core propositions of Intelligent Design as it applies to</p> <p>13 living things, biological life?</p> <p>14 A What do I understand them to be?</p> <p>15 Q Yes.</p> <p>16 A Well, it depends which -- these guys don't all hold the same</p> <p>17 views exactly. Okay. That's the first point, right?</p> <p>18 Intelligent Design is, in a sense, kind of a covering term</p> <p>19 for a lot of overlapping theories, you might say. I mean,</p> <p>20 there is this business of -- I mean, that Behe emphasizes of</p> <p>21 the irreducible complexity of cellular life. But then</p> <p>22 there's also the business with Dembski and the idea of design</p> <p>23 as a kind of explanatory filter that is not as probable as</p> <p>24 just mindless natural regularity, but not as improbable as</p> <p>25 chance. So these are kind of general notions that these guys</p>
<p>55</p> <p>1 arguments are arguments that, in a sense, are meant to be</p> <p>2 conducted on computers under mathematical terms. It's not</p> <p>3 R's not -- the old -- it is true that with Paley and a lot</p> <p>4 of these old guys, there is some kind of analogy which is</p> <p>5 parasitic on the idea that, you know, human beings are made</p> <p>6 in the image and likeness of God. So if humans can do it,</p> <p>7 then God can do it kind of in a bigger way. I understand</p> <p>8 that, and that's the theological basis for the design</p> <p>9 argument. But it seems to me now with science, we've got</p> <p>10 sort of -- we're now in a situation where the way we actually</p> <p>11 do science is one where we're in the design position, and</p> <p>12 we're kind of doing the sorts of things that let's say a</p> <p>13 creator would do if they were simulating a universe. And so</p> <p>14 I don't see the -- you know, so it's sort of a different</p> <p>15 basis for making the inference. Now, whether you're going</p> <p>16 to -- you know, I mean, I would suppose the tough question is</p> <p>17 whether there would ever be any kind of empirical way of</p> <p>18 resolving whether a simulated universe designed by a human</p> <p>19 being, to say this is how the world happened, could ever be</p> <p>20 proven empirically. And I don't know if that could happen.</p> <p>21 But then again, evolution's stuck with that problem, too.</p> <p>22 Everybody's kind of stuck with that problem.</p> <p>23 Q One of the things you say on the first page of your report is</p> <p>24 my expertise experts to a consideration of ID in its most</p> <p>25 developed forms.</p>	<p>57</p> <p>1 are working with as providing constraints on the possibility</p> <p>2 for life. Okay. And they're coming at it from somewhat</p> <p>3 different directions. So, I mean, that's what -- at least</p> <p>4 that's what I understand to be distinctive about the</p> <p>5 position, right, in the sense it makes it different from what</p> <p>6 evolutionists are saying.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. So if -- the answer to the question, you know, what is</p> <p>8 ID comprised of from a scientific standpoint is Behe's notion</p> <p>9 of irreducible complexity?</p> <p>10 A Yeah. And Dembski's explanatory filter. And those are the</p> <p>11 basic explanatory principles, the fundamental ones that are</p> <p>12 being developed now, it seems to me.</p> <p>13 Q Other than these two explanatory principles, are you aware of</p> <p>14 any other explanatory principles that are part of the</p> <p>15 Intelligent Design as a scientific concept?</p> <p>16 A Well, I would say at this level of generality, those are the</p> <p>17 main ones. I mean, there's -- Meyer has this sort of an</p> <p>18 information specification criterion as well. But, you know,</p> <p>19 if you were to look at any given science, you'd only come up</p> <p>20 with about two or three fundamental principles for any of</p> <p>21 them any way. So the fact that there aren't a whole lot of</p> <p>22 them, and they all seem to overlap or have something in</p> <p>23 common, that itself is not prejudicial, it seems to me.</p> <p>24 Q I'm not characterizing. I just want to make sure I</p> <p>25 understand what you understand Intelligent Design to be.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">58</p> <p>1 A Yeah. Yeah, yeah.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. So basically, the two big principles are irreducible</p> <p>3 complexity and the explanatory filter?</p> <p>4 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>5 Q That's a yes?</p> <p>6 A Yes, yes.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. I don't mean to be scolding you. I just want to make</p> <p>8 sure the record is clear. Do you consider yourself an expert</p> <p>9 on the proposition of irreducible complexity?</p> <p>10 A An expert on the proposition? Not an expert on the</p> <p>11 proposition, no. No, I don't do research in that area. No,</p> <p>12 I mean, you know, what I know is what I read of it. So I'm</p> <p>13 not -- I'm not adept in the area.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. Do you consider yourself an expert in Dembski's work,</p> <p>15 including the explanatory filter?</p> <p>16 A Not -- not -- I mean, maybe I'm not getting what you mean by</p> <p>17 expert. But it seems to me that the answer would be no.</p> <p>18 Unless you mean expert in a looser sense.</p> <p>19 Q Well, I mean, I think you've acknowledged, for example,</p> <p>20 you're not an expert in paleontology?</p> <p>21 A Uh-huh, yes.</p> <p>22 Q Same as me?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And I'm trying to understand, you know, paleontology, you</p> <p>25 would agree, is a discipline that at least in part is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">60</p> <p>1 orders being maintained that aren't so -- that aren't so</p> <p>2 necessary that it doesn't require any intelligence at all,</p> <p>3 but also not so random that you can't see evidence of</p> <p>4 intelligence either. So it's meant to be kind of a middle</p> <p>5 ground. And it's meant to be specified mathematically. And</p> <p>6 then it's been sort of discussed in those terms, whether one</p> <p>7 can do that.</p> <p>8 Q And do you have an understanding of whether one can do that?</p> <p>9 A Well, it seems to me that he hasn't done it yet. But he's</p> <p>10 kind of laid out a very interesting project in this respect</p> <p>11 in that, first of all, he translates the metaphysical notions</p> <p>12 into mathematically specifiable ones, and he enables then</p> <p>13 people who are adept in these areas to be able to contest</p> <p>14 whether certain cases that might be counted as design would</p> <p>15 fall into the way he's defined it because of the</p> <p>16 probabilities that they would be maintained or not. And so</p> <p>17 when he gets into these arguments with philosophers, you</p> <p>18 know, about probability theory, right, sometimes they say</p> <p>19 he's being too strict, sometimes they say he's being too</p> <p>20 loose as to what to count as design. Because remember, we're</p> <p>21 talking about a theory of design that just doesn't cover the</p> <p>22 origins of life, but covers everything that we might think of</p> <p>23 as being design, including artifacts. And so in a sense,</p> <p>24 it's fair game in terms of the kinds of examples that might</p> <p>25 be considered relevant for falling under this filter.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">59</p> <p>1 considered in the area of evolution?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. So now I'm looking at Intelligent Design, and you've</p> <p>4 identified a couple of sort of underlining explanatory</p> <p>5 principles and I'm trying to understand sort of parallel to</p> <p>6 what you said about paleontology, do you consider yourself an</p> <p>7 expert in irreducible complexity?</p> <p>8 A Right, okay. I'm not an expert in that area. That's</p> <p>9 correct.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And the same with Dembski's work?</p> <p>11 A That's correct.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Do you have some familiarity or understanding of what</p> <p>13 the explanatory filter is?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q And what is that?</p> <p>16 A Well, the explanatory filter is meant to provide a kind of</p> <p>17 probabilistic space. I mean, so the key thing -- first move</p> <p>18 that Dembski makes is to translate issues having to do with</p> <p>19 chance and design and regularity in nature into probability</p> <p>20 theory. So he tries to move it out of the metaphysical space</p> <p>21 into a mathematical space. And then the explanatory filter</p> <p>22 is going to be this -- this range of possibilities between</p> <p>23 regularity, physical regularity on the one hand, and chance</p> <p>24 on the other one which design can operate. So it has to be</p> <p>25 kind of within a range of probability of certain kinds of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">61</p> <p>1 And so he gets a lot of counterexamples that seem to</p> <p>2 sort of, in a way, not quite fit what he's trying to do. And</p> <p>3 he's had to -- he has to kind of respond to that. So I</p> <p>4 wouldn't say he's -- he has succeeded, but he has kind of --</p> <p>5 he hasn't succeeded in the sense of having nailed down the</p> <p>6 filter. But what he has succeeded in doing, I think, is</p> <p>7 laying out a research project as to say to identify the</p> <p>8 parameters of this filter, which in principle, should be able</p> <p>9 to do. And the way in which people are responding to him</p> <p>10 critically suggests that it is something that one can work</p> <p>11 with and do something with.</p> <p>12 Q Well, I think I'm understanding you to say he hasn't actually</p> <p>13 applied this explanatory filter to an aspect of biological</p> <p>14 life and shown that it was intelligently designed; is that</p> <p>15 correct?</p> <p>16 MR. GILLEN: Objection.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: But the theory is not that far advanced</p> <p>18 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>19 Q Okay. So he has not done that yet?</p> <p>20 MR. GILLEN: Objection to the form. You can go ahead.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Not that -- no, but I don't think he's</p> <p>22 intending to do that.</p> <p>23 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And you're not aware of anybody else taking his</p> <p>25 explanatory filter and applying it to an aspect of biological</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">62</p> <p>1 life to determine whether it's intelligently designed?</p> <p>2 A No. That's -- that's -- that's right. I mean, at least not</p> <p>3 doing it successfully. I mean, you have to look at the</p> <p>4 benchmarks here for -- well, I guess you would have to look</p> <p>5 at the benchmarks here. I mean, you might say also no one</p> <p>6 has successfully applied evolutionary theory to explain an</p> <p>7 aspect of human social life, though a lot of people have</p> <p>8 tried, but they get knocked back. So again, yes. But that's</p> <p>9 not surprising.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And are you aware of anybody even trying to apply the</p> <p>11 explanatory filter to an aspect of biological life to</p> <p>12 determine whether it was intelligently designed?</p> <p>13 A No, I'm not. But I'm not an expert, as you have just pointed</p> <p>14 out. So why would I know?</p> <p>15 Q Okay.</p> <p>16 A It might be happening.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And you also said it could -- that his explanatory</p> <p>18 filter could be applied to aspects of things other than</p> <p>19 biological?</p> <p>20 A Yes, yes, yes. It's a general -- yes. I mean, that's the</p> <p>21 interesting thing about it, yes.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And, for example, it might be applied to the</p> <p>23 determination of whether some artifact found lying on the</p> <p>24 ground was intelligently designed by human or not?</p> <p>25 A That's correct.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">64</p> <p>1 whether those things were intelligently designed or how they</p> <p>2 happened, correct?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q And he has not shown how that explanatory filter can address</p> <p>5 those questions, is that --</p> <p>6 A As far as -- look. As far as I know. But it seems to me the</p> <p>7 issue here is what happens, what does he do in the future</p> <p>8 about this, because if he does come up with another version</p> <p>9 of the explanatory filter that is able to take into account</p> <p>10 the counterexamples in a way that actually makes it more</p> <p>11 illuminating and doesn't just seem ad hoc, then he will have</p> <p>12 done a fine job, all right? I mean, so the point that there</p> <p>13 are counterexamples being brought up to his theory is not</p> <p>14 ipso facto damning. It depends how he responds to it.</p> <p>15 Now, again, I don't -- I haven't followed the latest</p> <p>16 breaking news on the Dembski research front. So I don't know</p> <p>17 exactly what he's doing with these counterexamples. But the</p> <p>18 very fact that he's kind of translated what was previously a</p> <p>19 metaphysical notion into mathematical form that allows the</p> <p>20 counterexamples to be raised is to me a step in the direction</p> <p>21 of science. And I think that's a very significant point that</p> <p>22 needs to be kept in mind here. Now, what he does after that,</p> <p>23 of course, is worth looking at. But the point is the</p> <p>24 significance of that has already been made from metaphysics</p> <p>25 to science once he put it into mathematical form and allowed</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">63</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And -- or -- but Mr. Dembski has not in fact done</p> <p>2 that, has he?</p> <p>3 A Well, but a lot -- some of the counterexamples that get</p> <p>4 raised against him are of this kind. See, I don't think</p> <p>5 that's a bad way to proceed because in a sense, our</p> <p>6 understanding of what design is is much more secure in the</p> <p>7 human area. So if we can kind of get a good sense of what it</p> <p>8 means mathematically to talk about what we consider to be</p> <p>9 intelligently designed by humans, we might then have a kind</p> <p>10 of rigorous benchmark against which we can then start talking</p> <p>11 about more exotic examples, like the ones that are relevant</p> <p>12 for trying to show that life is the product of design.</p> <p>13 Q But there -- he has had critics who have, in fact,</p> <p>14 identified --</p> <p>15 A Things that don't fit his -- yes.</p> <p>16 Q Well, they've actually -- haven't some of his critics said,</p> <p>17 you know, here's a test for Intelligent Design? A plane</p> <p>18 accident, a plane crash?</p> <p>19 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>20 Q Right? Is that right?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Or some, you know, sort of historical artifact, correct?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And have raised the challenge to Dr. Dembski to show how his</p> <p>25 explanatory filter could be used to determine whether --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">65</p> <p>1 the counterexamples to be made.</p> <p>2 Q But what is your understanding of these counterexamples? Is</p> <p>3 it that they have -- that critics have taken these</p> <p>4 counterexamples and used some probabilistic method to</p> <p>5 determine what happened to them? Or have they been raised as</p> <p>6 examples that Dr. Dembski needs to apply his method to to</p> <p>7 show that it works at all?</p> <p>8 A Yes, the latter. I mean, but is this damning? Yes. I mean,</p> <p>9 I agree with you. But what follows?</p> <p>10 Q Isn't the challenge to Dr. Dembski right now that your method</p> <p>11 is useless?</p> <p>12 A The fact that you bring up counterexamples doesn't mean that</p> <p>13 it doesn't explain anything. Right. I mean, in fact the way</p> <p>14 the general verdict on somebody like Dembski is that, you</p> <p>15 know, it sort of leads -- it's kind of -- it doesn't quite</p> <p>16 fit the full range of things that we normally consider</p> <p>17 design. It tends to include certain things that we don't</p> <p>18 want to call design, and it tends to exclude other things</p> <p>19 that we do want to call design. So in that sense, the</p> <p>20 mathematical parameters aren't being set quite right. And</p> <p>21 that might indicate some fundamental flaw in the way he's</p> <p>22 conceptualizing the problem, okay? That's what the state of</p> <p>23 play is with him. It's not that he can't explain anything,</p> <p>24 but rather he doesn't quite -- the sort of universalization</p> <p>25 that he is aspiring to by laying out this model isn't</p>

<p>66</p> <p>1 satisfied by virtue of the counterexamples that can be</p> <p>2 raised. It doesn't mean that it can't explain anything. It</p> <p>3 means it can't explain everything. Those are two different</p> <p>4 states. And a lot depends on how he develops from there.</p> <p>5 Q Other than what we've discussed about your reading of</p> <p>6 portions of Dr. Behe's work and portions of Dr. Dembski's</p> <p>7 work, what else have you done to educate yourself about the</p> <p>8 subject of Intelligent Design?</p> <p>9 A Well, I have looked into the -- the history -- well, I mean,</p> <p>10 first of all, a general -- a general understanding of the</p> <p>11 history of biology, and especially the way in which Darwinism</p> <p>12 has been related to these larger design issues historically,</p> <p>13 and also the way in which fundamentalist religion and so</p> <p>14 forth have played a role. I mean, I've sort of done a lot of</p> <p>15 backfilling, you might say, to get a sense of where this</p> <p>16 stuff comes from. And also to look at some of the</p> <p>17 non-evolutionary forms of biology that seem -- from the</p> <p>18 pre-Darwinian period that seemed to have some resonance with</p> <p>19 some of these arguments that we're seeing today. I mean, in</p> <p>20 a way, what it's caused me to do is to look at a lot of stuff</p> <p>21 that I've looked at in the past in a somewhat different</p> <p>22 light, because what I see Intelligent Design as doing is more</p> <p>23 so than the earlier creation, is pulling together lots of</p> <p>24 strands from the history of science in a way that's been</p> <p>25 marginalized by Darwinism, like the design argument, for</p>	<p>68</p> <p>1 was referring to this -- this kind of form that was the</p> <p>2 previous form that was dominant in the trials that were over</p> <p>3 evolution and creation in this country in the '80's, right,</p> <p>4 which was the kind of biblical, literalist six day stuff,</p> <p>5 whereas now, we've got Intelligent Design as really being on</p> <p>6 the dock, rather than this -- at least as far as I</p> <p>7 understand. I don't -- I don't -- maybe you're going to tell</p> <p>8 me the six day stuff is being discussed. But as far as I</p> <p>9 understand, we're talking about a different thing now. But</p> <p>10 of course, there's still earlier forms of -- there are other</p> <p>11 forms of creationism that are actually scientifically more</p> <p>12 sophisticated, kind of wedded to the Paley style arguments of</p> <p>13 the past, but not necessarily committed to a sort of six day</p> <p>14 biblical, literalist view.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. So --</p> <p>16 A So creationism is kind of a big thing, right.</p> <p>17 Q Right. And Intelligent Design is one --</p> <p>18 A Part of that, yeah. But --</p> <p>19 Q But don't --</p> <p>20 A Some of --</p> <p>21 Q I'm sorry, you're -- Intelligent Design is creationism; just</p> <p>22 not six day creationism?</p> <p>23 MR. GILLEN: I object to the form.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: It is a kind of creationism. It is a kind</p> <p>25 of creationism.</p>
<p>67</p> <p>1 example. Sort of retaking that seriously. So it causes me</p> <p>2 to sort of re-examine the history, kind of look at it</p> <p>3 somewhat differently. It's also caused me to wonder about</p> <p>4 the extent to which Darwinism has been a scientific</p> <p>5 revolution as well. I mean, so that it's a sense in which</p> <p>6 it's been that kind -- that kind of thing more generally.</p> <p>7 Q Couple things I want to follow up on that you just said.</p> <p>8 First of all, you referred to ID or Intelligent Design in</p> <p>9 comparison to earlier forms of creationism. What did you</p> <p>10 mean by that?</p> <p>11 A Well, I mean the kinds of things that were being discussed in</p> <p>12 the Arkansas trial back in '82, where one was still talking</p> <p>13 about, you know, six day creation and sort of biblical</p> <p>14 literalist basis.</p> <p>15 Q You've used this phrase ID in conjunction with earlier forms</p> <p>16 of creationism, not just in your previous answer, but also in</p> <p>17 your report. And I infer from that what you mean is</p> <p>18 Intelligent Design is a modern view of creationism?</p> <p>19 MR. GILLEN: Objection to the form.</p> <p>20 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>21 Q Is that correct?</p> <p>22 A Well, again, yes, in a sense. But, I mean, not all</p> <p>23 creationism has been six day creationism. So keep that in</p> <p>24 mind, that when I was answering your previous question, I was</p> <p>25 referring to -- when I said earlier forms of creationism, I</p>	<p>69</p> <p>1 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>2 Q Okay, okay. And when you use the word creationism, what do</p> <p>3 you mean?</p> <p>4 A Well, I mean that -- the idea that there is a kind of a</p> <p>5 unified order to nature that is evidence of Intelligent</p> <p>6 Design. I mean, what we now call Intelligent Design, which</p> <p>7 used to be called the creator, because the creator was always</p> <p>8 the person who had the Intelligent Design. So there is this</p> <p>9 historical lineage. I don't think that's controversial.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. When did you first start -- I mean, is it fair to say</p> <p>11 that you have studied Intelligent Design?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. When did you first start studying Intelligent Design?</p> <p>14 A Well, I don't know -- you know, it's funny. I don't know</p> <p>15 whether it was being called that then. But certainly -- see,</p> <p>16 I went to the University of Pittsburgh which is where Larry</p> <p>17 Laudan used to teach. And as you may know, Larry Laudan</p> <p>18 wrote a couple of articles that were very scathing of Michael</p> <p>19 Ruse's participation on the evolution side of the Arkansas</p> <p>20 case about saying how this was misusing the expertise and</p> <p>21 philosophy of science. And he was drawing this distinction</p> <p>22 between the difference between a theory being true and false</p> <p>23 versus a theory being scientific. And he was making the</p> <p>24 argument that in a sense, you might want to say creationism</p> <p>25 is scientifically false, which is not -- you know, which is</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">70</p> <p>1 two different matters. And that got me interested in what 2 was going on there with the definitions of science and so 3 forth. So this would be when I was a graduate student, maybe 4 in the 1980's. That's when I first started -- and so, for 5 example, I bought the volume that Marcel LaFollette had put 6 out on the Arkansas case with MIT. I bought that as a 7 graduate student. And so I kept kind of some tabs on the 8 side about what was going on with that because that seemed to 9 be the -- the public space where my own field in the history 10 and philosophy of science was actually having the most 11 relevance in terms of any kind of policy issues. So I'd been 12 keeping tabs on that over the years.</p> <p>13 Q And -- and, you know, you used the phrase ID in its most 14 developed forms. And then you -- and you said that what you 15 meant by that was sort of the Dembski/Behe Intelligent 16 Design?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q When did you start studying that?</p> <p>19 A Well, let's see. I first -- I think it was -- this may be 20 as -- I mean, I've known John Angus Campbell for a long time 21 largely through the connections in rhetoric that I have with 22 him. And he may have one time, and this -- maybe this verges 23 on the discussion of Intelligent Design. He suggested I see 24 a talk by Dembski, and -- and I did. And that was when I 25 started getting -- getting interested. So I guess that would</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">72</p> <p>1 make sure we're on the same page, okay?</p> <p>2 A Sure.</p> <p>3 Q And you're -- you are taking the position in this case that 4 Intelligent Design is a form of scientific inquiry?</p> <p>5 A Right. But I didn't have in mind that anyone who believes 6 that the earth is six to ten thousand years old.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. So, you know, you do have in your mind that there is a 8 sort of defining content to Intelligent Design?</p> <p>9 A Yeah, Yeah.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And do you understand that idea of Intelligent Design 11 to take any position -- what you understand Intelligent 12 Design to be, do you understand it to take a position on the 13 age of the earth?</p> <p>14 A I actually don't think that the -- that the -- that it's 15 required that it take a specific position. But some of these 16 guys may have positions based on their arguments. So, for 17 example, I guess I could imagine that some of these guys may 18 think that the earth is somewhat younger than evolutionists 19 would say, given the nature of the theory. I could see that. 20 But, I mean, the six to ten thousand year old figure is 21 something that's taken from the earlier form of creationism. 22 And I just don't believe that's carrying through.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. So -- and -- and what I -- I mean, for example, the 24 area of evolution does actually incorporate the sort of 25 modern understanding of the age of the earth into the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">71</p> <p>1 be about 1996 maybe.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Do you have an understanding of what position, if any, 3 Intelligent Design takes on the age of the earth?</p> <p>4 A I take it doesn't have just one view. I take it that these 5 people hold somewhat different views.</p> <p>6 Q Meaning some Intelligent Design proponents consider the earth 7 relatively young, six to ten thousand years, and some 8 consider it billions of years old?</p> <p>9 MR. GILLEN: Object to the form.</p> <p>10 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>11 Q Is that your understanding of --</p> <p>12 A Well, do any of the guys that I considered developed think 13 it's six to ten thousands years old?</p> <p>14 Q Well, I'm asking you. What --</p> <p>15 A I don't know that. I mean -- I mean, again, if we're now 16 going to use Intelligent Design to also include all the young 17 earth people, you know, as it were, retrospectively include 18 them all, then maybe that's true. But I guess the people 19 I've been reading I've never gotten the impression they 20 believe the six to ten thousand years story.</p> <p>21 Q And I guess I -- you know, I want to make sure, you know, we 22 have this phrase out here Intelligent Design, and you've used 23 the term Intelligent Design movement. You've talked about 24 developed -- the Intelligent Design in its most developed 25 form. So when we use the word Intelligent Design, I want to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">73</p> <p>1 scientific theory, is that fair?</p> <p>2 A Oh, indeed. It's even partly responsible for it.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And -- and -- and -- and what I'm asking you is now 4 looking at Intelligent Design, does Intelligent Design 5 incorporate or take a position on the age of the earth one 6 way or the other as part of its scientific content?</p> <p>7 A See, I don't think -- I mean, here's where we run into the 8 problem of Intelligent Design being relatively young science. 9 It doesn't have as it were well worked out canonical views on 10 everything the way you can say so easily of evolutionary 11 theory, okay? I mean, I think -- I think the age of the 12 earth is not -- has not become central for the kinds of 13 things these people have wanted to do so far, okay? But, you 14 know, so as a result, I think the question is open there. I 15 mean --</p> <p>16 Q I mean, right now, Intelligent Design is agnostic on that 17 issue; is that fair?</p> <p>18 A I guess open minded would be the word for it. I don't 19 think -- because I don't think that -- see, I mean, you have 20 to wait until the science kind of develops a bit more, to 21 see -- and see them then having to deal with all these 22 questions, because that's obviously a fair question to ask of 23 these people, right? But I don't think there's -- I mean, 24 there's hardly any kind of, as it were, canonical views about 25 the fundamental principles. They're pursuing at -- pursuing</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">74</p> <p>1 the program from many different angles. So not surprisingly,</p> <p>2 there isn't going to be consensus on this. I don't think</p> <p>3 it's really necessary at this stage.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. And what about the principle of common descent? Do</p> <p>5 you understand Intelligent Design to have taken a position on</p> <p>6 the subject of common descent?</p> <p>7 MR. GILLEN: Object to the form.</p> <p>8 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>9 Q And let me actually -- let me preface that, you use the word</p> <p>10 common descent in your report. What do you mean by that?</p> <p>11 A Well, common descent, the idea that at the end of the day,</p> <p>12 all the -- there's no special creation of forms, of life</p> <p>13 forms. Rather they all come from sort of common evolutionary</p> <p>14 background that can be sort of plotted out tree-like fashion.</p> <p>15 And the point that I make in the rebuttal, which I think is</p> <p>16 something that the Intelligent Design people play around</p> <p>17 with, you might say, is the fact that there is -- that there</p> <p>18 is controversy over how exactly one establishes descent in</p> <p>19 evolutionary theory. Whether one uses purely genetic</p> <p>20 criteria where you in fact can see history -- you can see</p> <p>21 sort of that one organism came from another, or does one just</p> <p>22 look at morphological similarities? The fact that organisms</p> <p>23 are similarly structured in a way as indicating relationship.</p> <p>24 And because evolution isn't completely consistent on how they</p> <p>25 exactly map all these organisms as having common descent,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">76</p> <p>1 they do disagree amongst themselves, but they keep that to</p> <p>2 their peer reviewed journals. They don't take that as</p> <p>3 representing some kind of bigger problem in the idea of</p> <p>4 common descent itself, which is what the Intelligent Design</p> <p>5 people in a way draw attention to and try to take -- and take</p> <p>6 advantage of in that sense. Namely, showing, look, there's</p> <p>7 more descent in the evolutionary ranks than you guys are</p> <p>8 willing to admit.</p> <p>9 Q Yeah. And I'll tell you, you know, what you wrote about</p> <p>10 common descent took my breath away because what I understood</p> <p>11 you to be talking about was a disagreement about how you</p> <p>12 classify.</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q You could, you know, with different methods of classification</p> <p>15 you will -- the tree that you portray will look different</p> <p>16 with one method than another?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And what took my breath away was that you would characterize</p> <p>19 those kind of disagreements as calling the entire principle</p> <p>20 of common descent into question. And I wonder from where do</p> <p>21 you extract that?</p> <p>22 A Well, if you can't explain how it happened, if you can't have</p> <p>23 a consistent method for showing it, how do you know there's</p> <p>24 something to show? I mean, I would have thought as a basic</p> <p>25 principle of science you need a consistent methodology for</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">75</p> <p>1 there have been some Intelligent Design people as well as</p> <p>2 some people who are -- who are working within taxonomy and</p> <p>3 don't necessarily take a view on Intelligent Design, versus</p> <p>4 evolution, saying that we may need to call into question the</p> <p>5 idea of common descent if we can't come up with a consistent</p> <p>6 criteria for establishing it. Because common descent is a</p> <p>7 dogma of evolutionary theory, which evidence gets mobilized</p> <p>8 to support. But the criteria by which you establish this</p> <p>9 common descent varies from organism to organism, and -- and</p> <p>10 depending on how -- if you map it out consistently, you can</p> <p>11 end up getting two quite different evolutionary trees.</p> <p>12 So -- you know, so -- so -- I mean, Pennock makes the</p> <p>13 point that common descent is a dogma of evolutionary theory.</p> <p>14 It's a dogma, but it's not a fact. I mean, it's really a</p> <p>15 contested area. And intelligent design in a sense, you</p> <p>16 know, takes advantage of that.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. What do you mean, takes advantage?</p> <p>18 A Well, in the sense that it shows that -- and which is, I</p> <p>19 think, something that's not uncommon in evolutionary theory;</p> <p>20 namely, that there could be -- that you could have people in</p> <p>21 biology agreeing on the same principle, but having different</p> <p>22 ways of enforcing the principle, you might say. So you've</p> <p>23 got all these evolutionary biologists saying we believe in</p> <p>24 common descent. But how exactly they would show common</p> <p>25 descent between organisms may differ. But there's -- and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">77</p> <p>1 being able to show a pattern that you're then going to use as</p> <p>2 something to explain, because common descent is supposed,</p> <p>3 what evolution is supposed to explain, right? And it is a</p> <p>4 little surprising that there isn't a common method, agreed</p> <p>5 upon method for actually showing the common descent.</p> <p>6 Q Well, you've mentioned that -- that biologists have studied</p> <p>7 and demonstrated morphological similarities?</p> <p>8 A Sure. And that's the traditional way. That's the</p> <p>9 traditional way.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And they have also, and particularly in mod -- in very</p> <p>11 modern times been able to identify similarity in gene</p> <p>12 sequence?</p> <p>13 A That's right. And they don't give you the same results.</p> <p>14 They don't give you the same tree patterns. That's the --</p> <p>15 that's a problem.</p> <p>16 Q Can you identify any scientists working in the field of</p> <p>17 evolutionary biology who have -- who have asserted that that</p> <p>18 disagreement in classification may require discarding the</p> <p>19 entire idea of common descent?</p> <p>20 A Well, I think -- I mean, it depends what you mean by</p> <p>21 evolution biology. I mean, if you mean it in the broadest</p> <p>22 sense, where you're including the science of taxonomy, then</p> <p>23 you do have these people, these cladistics people who I</p> <p>24 referred to, who in fact do think that one should be kind of</p> <p>25 agnostic on the point until we get a kind of clearer</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">78</p> <p>1 understanding of, you know, how to -- how to organize the</p> <p>2 the various trees. So they tend to be agnostic on evolution</p> <p>3 as an overall process.</p> <p>4 Q Who are you talking about?</p> <p>5 A Who am I talking about? Well, I mean, one of the main guys</p> <p>6 is called Petersen. I mean, there's a book that I cite by a</p> <p>7 guy named Henry Gee. And these are, you know, reasonable</p> <p>8 guys. But they're working very narrowly in the field of</p> <p>9 biological taxonomy. And that's all they're really primarily</p> <p>10 concerned about. And it points, I think, to a more general</p> <p>11 problem with the so-called evolutionary synthesis. Namely,</p> <p>12 that the different sub-branches of biology that are</p> <p>13 supposedly all covered by evolutionary biology in fact all</p> <p>14 operate in their own independent sphere relatively speaking</p> <p>15 And even though they're not constantly contesting the</p> <p>16 assumptions of the others, nevertheless, there are some</p> <p>17 serious working disagreements. And so if you're just focused</p> <p>18 on taxonomy, and your main thing is to try to, you know, sort</p> <p>19 of organize the species in some kind of way to make sense of</p> <p>20 you know, of descent patterns, and you have these two</p> <p>21 alternative methods, then, you know, it seems to me that all</p> <p>22 discussions about evolutionary explanations are put on hold</p> <p>23 until you've sorted this out. I mean, that's what it looks</p> <p>24 like for somebody who's a taxonomist.</p> <p>25 Q When you say -- what are you referring to when you say</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">80</p> <p>1 A But that doesn't require -- common descent is a common issue</p> <p>2 from --</p> <p>3 Q Yes. And what I'm trying to understand is, are the</p> <p>4 taxonomists saying slow down about common descent, or are</p> <p>5 they saying slow down on your explanations of how the</p> <p>6 evolution occurred?</p> <p>7 A Well, they're saying slow down on common descent, because</p> <p>8 that's the thing that kind of really verges on their</p> <p>9 bailiwick, right, that they're really experts on. I mean, I</p> <p>10 think many of these people are just sort of agnostic on this</p> <p>11 larger point about random mutation and natural selection. I</p> <p>12 mean, at least it doesn't really enter directly into the</p> <p>13 sorts of stuff that they write about in their professional</p> <p>14 journals.</p> <p>15 Q So you understand the taxonomists to be saying until we can</p> <p>16 agree on our methodology for portraying the tree of life, we</p> <p>17 shouldn't take any position about whether there was common</p> <p>18 descent at all?</p> <p>19 A Well, it's not an issue they can decide. That's right. It's</p> <p>20 an agnostic issue. Right. It's outside the expertise.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Would you agree that paleontology is one of the</p> <p>22 disciplines that is relevant to addressing these questions?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And would you agree that a paleontologist would have</p> <p>25 greater expertise on the issues of the classification of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">79</p> <p>1 evolutionary explanations?</p> <p>2 A Well, I mean, evolutionary -- well, insofar -- remember,</p> <p>3 people like Pennock are claiming that common descent is the</p> <p>4 fundamental fact that evolution explains, right? But if we</p> <p>5 can't even establish consistently common descent, then one</p> <p>6 shouldn't be rushing to evolutionary explanations of</p> <p>7 something we can't give a common account of -- we can't give</p> <p>8 a consistent account of. One should get the phenomena well</p> <p>9 grounded first and then come up with the explanation. And</p> <p>10 that's what the taxonomists are saying.</p> <p>11 Q Who?</p> <p>12 A These -- this particular purist school of taxonomists.</p> <p>13 Q But what are the -- are the taxonomists questioning common</p> <p>14 descent or the evolutionary explanations?</p> <p>15 A No. They're -- well, they're saying, look, that</p> <p>16 evolutionists operate with alternative ways of dealing with</p> <p>17 the idea of common descent. Okay. And the question is that</p> <p>18 one has to sort this issue out first before one can then go</p> <p>19 and explain things because the nature of the evolutionary</p> <p>20 explanation may be different, depending on how you align.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. And for example, an evolutionary explanation, one</p> <p>22 prominent one is natural -- random mutation and natural</p> <p>23 selection, correct?</p> <p>24 A Right.</p> <p>25 Q And when the taxonomists are saying --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">81</p> <p>1 biological life than you do?</p> <p>2 A Sure. But -- yeah.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And getting back to how I started this line of</p> <p>4 questioning, do you have an understanding of whether the --</p> <p>5 the Intelligent Design as you've used the term in your report</p> <p>6 takes a position on the principle of common descent?</p> <p>7 A It seems to me it's agnostic on this.</p> <p>8 Q And then you would -- you also brought up the term of special</p> <p>9 creation. And what do you mean by that?</p> <p>10 A Well, the idea each of the species are sort of specially</p> <p>11 created, as it were, by God or something. You know, they --</p> <p>12 they sort of -- you know, they sort of arise and -- yeah. I</p> <p>13 guess that would be the model for it, right. That in some</p> <p>14 sense, there is no sort of common form of life they come</p> <p>15 from, but rather that each one is made specially, you know,</p> <p>16 by design in that sense.</p> <p>17 Q And arose from where?</p> <p>18 A I don't hold the view myself. But, you know, presumably from</p> <p>19 some divine blueprint or something. I mean, Linnaeus, the</p> <p>20 father of modern taxonomy held this view.</p> <p>21 Q And you used the word design blueprint. But, I mean, I'm</p> <p>22 asking, how'd they get there?</p> <p>23 A How did they get there? Well, this is -- this is --</p> <p>24 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: This is the -- this is a remnant of the --</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">82</p> <p>1 this is a -- this is a remnant of the old biblical creation 2 story. And Linnacus was a very devout guy. I mean, and so 3 he -- that's kind of his view, right. That God kind of, 4 using, you know, form into matter, produced these different 5 species. 6 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING: 7 Q Something out of nothing? 8 A Well, not -- 9 MR. GILLEN: Object to form. 10 THE WITNESS: Well, it's not quite something out of 11 nothing. I mean, it's -- you know, it's giving form to 12 matter. I think that's more the way to look at it, right. 13 And that's where the blueprint part comes in. 14 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING: 15 Q Yeah. And I mean, if you talk about special creation of a 16 human? 17 A Yeah. That would be a prime -- yeah, a prime example. 18 Q Okay. And what do we mean by that? 19 MR. GILLEN: Object to form. 20 THE WITNESS: Well, I assume that -- that the human 21 arose under special conditions that could not -- that did not 22 derive from the formation of other forms of life. Right. So 23 in a way, special creation is kind of the, you know, exact 24 opposite of common descent. 25 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">84</p> <p>1 A Well, what do you mean by that exactly? 2 Q Well, you agree that it has merit. Do you -- as between the 3 two competing prob -- well, let me withdraw that for a 4 second. Do you think that the concept of Intelligent Design 5 as it currently exists has scientific merit? 6 A Yes, I do. I mean, and let me just say this because I think 7 maybe this is what you're asking, that I believe at the 8 moment that evolutionary theory is better able to explain 9 what it sets out to explain than Intelligent Design can. 10 Okay. But both of them seem to me to be proceeding in 11 scientific -- in a scientific way with respect to their own 12 research agendas. 13 Q You say in your report that Pennock notes correctly that some 14 ID proponents adhere to a scientifically updated version of 15 the biblical doctrine of special creation whereby each 16 species is individually created, right? Who -- who are you 17 referring to when you say that? Who was Pennock writing 18 about? 19 MR. GILLEN: Where is that? 20 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING: 21 Q I'm sorry, it's on page three. 22 A No, no. I did say that. 23 MR. GILLEN: I'm just -- 24 THE WITNESS: Let me think. I think this may be 25 something that somebody like Phillip Johnson said about human</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">83</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And -- 2 A But I don't hold this view myself, you see. 3 Q Do you hold a view about whether evolution -- and let me back 4 up. We've used the terms evolution and Darwinism. And in 5 your report, you used the word Neo-Darwinism. And I would 6 like to have an agreed term for the current scientific corpus 7 of evolution. Is it -- what term would you use for that? Or 8 can we agree that we'll use evolution? 9 A Well, I mean, technically, I guess, the Neo-Darwinian 10 synthesis, right? So the combination of the natural history 11 side that comes from Darwin's own lineage, so we're talking 12 about paleontology, natural history, those kinds of things, 13 with the genetics, right, and the more laboratory based stuff 14 which comes together in the 1930's and '40's, which is the 15 basis of the modern Neo-Darwinian synthesis is the basis of 16 evolution today. 17 Q Okay. So when we're talking about the scientific theory of 18 evolution, that's what we're talking about? 19 A We're talking about that thing that emerged in the '30's and 20 '40's. 21 Q Okay. Do you hold a view about which -- whether the 22 scientific theory of evolution has merit? 23 A Yes, it has merit. 24 Q Okay. Do you hold -- have a position about whether it has 25 greater merit than the concept of Intelligent Design?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">85</p> <p>1 beings. So, I mean, because when I think of the special 2 creation thing, I'm usually thinking about the extent to 3 which human beings, right, have a sort of distinctive form of 4 creation, because that's usually where the issue arises. So 5 I was thinking about Philip Johnson, probably. 6 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING: 7 Q Do you understand that concept of special creation to be part 8 of the science of Intelligent Design? 9 A It can be. I mean, I don't know if at the moment it is. But 10 it certainly can be, very much like the idea of design itself 11 can -- you know, so with design, right, it starts off as this 12 kind of theological notion that Paley cooks up. But then it 13 gets mathematically specified by Dembski, and people can 14 argue about it on mathematical grounds without bringing in 15 Dembski's religious assumptions such as they are. Well, I 16 don't see why one -- why special creation couldn't undergo a 17 similar process, especially if one imagines -- I'll give you 18 an analogy. The history of anthropology has had -- had a 19 very big dispute in the late 19th and early 20th Century over 20 the origins of human beings, with some people arguing for 21 polygenesis, which is to say in a sense multiple origins for 22 human being, as where each race has its own separate origin, 23 and a kind of special creationism applied to humans, right. 24 And this was kind of taken seriously in anthropology and 25 people were trying to find evidence for it. And it was done</p>

<p>86</p> <p>1 in a very empirical kind of manner, thinking about whether</p> <p>2 it's possible for migration to have taken place from Africa</p> <p>3 to Asia and so forth. Eventually people dropped the</p> <p>4 question. But the point was that was an example of a</p> <p>5 question that was very clearly, theologically motivated by</p> <p>6 sort of special creation considerations, and then got</p> <p>7 translated into a kind of an empirically tractable form, and</p> <p>8 then was eventually relinquished. And it seems to me that</p> <p>9 perhaps something could happen to the idea of special</p> <p>10 creation within the Intelligent Design movement more</p> <p>11 generally if you imagine -- so rather than imagining as it</p> <p>12 were one big bang, you know, or one kind of moment of the</p> <p>13 origin of life, that one imagined there were multiple ones.</p> <p>14 And as it were, the chemical configurations were somewhat</p> <p>15 different in these multiple origins, and that then somehow</p> <p>16 led to the different species or families of species to exist.</p> <p>17 I mean, one might be able to turn that into a scientifically</p> <p>18 tractable proposition. I don't think it's out of the</p> <p>19 question. It probably hasn't been done yet. I don't think</p> <p>20 it's been done. But it's not out of the question. So this</p> <p>21 is where one has to look at the subsequent history of these</p> <p>22 ideas once it's put in the hands of these people for a while.</p> <p>23 MR. ROTHSCHILD: This would be a good time to arrange</p> <p>24 lunch.</p> <p>25 MR. GILLEN: Certainly.</p>	<p>88</p> <p>1 looking at problems with trying to explain the cell if one</p> <p>2 takes as given the backdrop of evolutionary theory about how</p> <p>3 cells maintain their stability and so forth. So it's, in a</p> <p>4 sense, he's in the business of re-interpreting, sort of</p> <p>5 re-explaining certain kinds of phenomena that have already</p> <p>6 been studied. So he's sort of more on the bottom up side.</p> <p>7 So it's somewhat -- I mean, yes, but relatively elementary.</p> <p>8 But I think he does -- he does point to -- to an interesting</p> <p>9 fact. Namely, that it's been possible to sort of study the</p> <p>10 biology of cells in a fairly self-contained manner without</p> <p>11 making commitments one way or the other to evolutionary</p> <p>12 biology. And irreducible complexity is meant to be some kind</p> <p>13 of account that sort of, as it were, says, well, look,</p> <p>14 imagine that the cells are in some sense specially created,</p> <p>15 right, that they have this sort of special kind of stability</p> <p>16 to them. So, I mean, that's how I see somebody like Behe.</p> <p>17 So they're not -- but they're both at relatively early</p> <p>18 stages, I would say.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. Given that these sort of two core principles of</p> <p>20 Intelligent Design are at their early stages, do you have an</p> <p>21 opinion about whether Intelligent Design as it's currently</p> <p>22 comprised should be taught to ninth graders?</p> <p>23 A Yes, I do believe it should.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And why is that?</p> <p>25 A Well, because I think it does provide a very sort of</p>
<p>87</p> <p>1 (A brief recess taken at 11:26 a.m.)</p> <p>2 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>3 Q When we were discussing Dr. Dembski's work, I think, is it</p> <p>4 fair to characterize your answers as that he has -- that his</p> <p>5 concept of the explanatory filter has not been applied to</p> <p>6 specific examples in any meaningful way?</p> <p>7 A Not as far as I know.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And in your view, that's not necessarily problematic</p> <p>9 for Intelligent Design?</p> <p>10 A That's correct.</p> <p>11 Q And that's because it's sort of -- Intelligent Design is at</p> <p>12 its relatively early stages?</p> <p>13 A Yes. And also because the fact that he was able to put the</p> <p>14 problem in mathematical form itself marked an advance over</p> <p>15 the Paley version of it that you referred to earlier. So</p> <p>16 there's already a kind of a big leap in the direction of</p> <p>17 science by having done what he's done.</p> <p>18 Q And then in terms of Dr. Behe's work, is that at a similarly</p> <p>19 early state, the concept of irreducible complexity?</p> <p>20 A Well, there I think there's something different going on. I</p> <p>21 mean, this is why I say, I mean, I see Intelligent Design as</p> <p>22 kind of a movement that's coming from different directions</p> <p>23 because whereas Dembski is sort of operating from a very top</p> <p>24 down approach, where he's sort of taking the idea of design</p> <p>25 and trying to make it rigorous in some way, Behe is actually</p>	<p>89</p> <p>1 interesting, accessible and exciting prospect for thinking</p> <p>2 about the nature of life. I wouldn't say it should be</p> <p>3 treated exclusively by any means. And it certainly shouldn't</p> <p>4 be treated as the dominant view. But I do believe it should</p> <p>5 be taught. And I think it will actually -- it would actually</p> <p>6 motivate students to enter into science and to study the</p> <p>7 nature of life because historically, a lot of the people who</p> <p>8 ended up as evolutionists kind of started off trying to think</p> <p>9 about what Intelligent Design might be involved in nature.</p> <p>10 Q You refer to earlier forms of creationism. Do you have an</p> <p>11 opinion about whether the earlier forms of creationism should</p> <p>12 be taught to high school students?</p> <p>13 A I don't think the six day stuff should be taught, or the</p> <p>14 biblical literalism stuff because I don't think you really</p> <p>15 see any kind of development there that would warrant it as</p> <p>16 science. I mean, I do think there one has to sort of draw</p> <p>17 the distinction you're in a sense getting a kind of view of</p> <p>18 the nature of life that is pretty much grounded on a sort of</p> <p>19 dogmatic interpretation of text that is not going to change</p> <p>20 regardless of what the evidence turns out to be.</p> <p>21 Q Have you ever heard the term creation science?</p> <p>22 A Yeah, that was kind of the old -- yeah. Back in the '80s,</p> <p>23 that was kind of used a lot.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And what's your understanding of what creation science</p> <p>25 is relative to creationism?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">90</p> <p>1 A Well, creation science was originally an attempt to sort 2 of -- I mean, I think in light of the Arkansas case, right, 3 it was seen as a way of trying to bring in these biblical 4 principles into the science classroom by making it look as 5 though there were scientific grounds for holding what turned 6 out to be biblical beliefs. And so sometimes fossils would 7 be appealed to, sometimes they would be dismissed out of 8 hand, depending on what kind of suited the purpose of the 9 textbook writer. But there was no real clear evidence of any 10 kind of internal development taking place. It was rather, it 11 seemed like kind of camouflage strategy. I mean, at least 12 that seems to be the final verdict on this.</p> <p>13 Q And do you -- to you, Intelligent Design is different than 14 creation science?</p> <p>15 A Yes, I think so. I think -- not only do I think it's 16 different, I think also its critics treat it differently. 17 That is to say, including the critics who don't want to see 18 it taught.</p> <p>19 Q And in what respects is Intelligent Design different than 20 creation science?</p> <p>21 A Well, because you, first of all, Intelligent Design actually 22 more self-consciously draws on these wider traditions of 23 Western thought from natural theology and onward that have 24 been marginalized by Darwin which try to deal with larger 25 questions about the nature of life, and which did have some</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">92</p> <p>1 see, so all of that I think is indicating that intelligent 2 Design is really scientific, and isn't very much reliant 3 anymore in whatever historical connections it's had with 4 religion.</p> <p>5 Q If you took Dembski's work away, and you took Behe's work 6 away, and I understand you're not going to do that. But 7 would there then be any distinction between Intelligent 8 Design and creationism?</p> <p>9 A Well, there's Meyer where I --</p> <p>10 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>11 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>12 Q Let me just finish. I mean, in other words, if you took Behe 13 away and you took Dembski away and they'd never written, and 14 nobody had replaced them, would you have any basis then to 15 say Intelligent Design has developed in a way that 16 constitutes science?</p> <p>17 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Well, let's see. First of all, we haven't 19 talked about Meyer's work which I'm not intimately familiar 20 with. But of course there is that sort of strand there as 21 well. But I take it you're after -- your -- the thrust of 22 your question is that, you know, if you took away these three 23 guys or four guys, or how many, you know, finite number of 24 guys, would there be any Intelligent Design? I actually 25 think -- see, we've so far been discussing this issue of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">91</p> <p>1 kind of, you know, proto-scientific development. Like 2 Paley's argument and so forth, and then tries to put it in a 3 more scientifically rigorous form like Dembski's done with 4 the explanatory filter. And so you do see a development. 5 And you also -- and in the way in which the critics treat it. 6 So when the philosophers are debating with Dembski, they 7 explicitly say, let's put aside his religious assumptions and 8 just deal with his arguments on their face. And the kinds of 9 arguments they give, first of all, it's published in their 10 main peer reviewed journals, in the Glossary of Science in 11 the United States. And he responds there. And it's an 12 argument that, you know, they could be having with anyone, 13 right, who they would normally respect as being scientific 14 and so forth. And Michael Ruse, when he writes, I mean, he's 15 an interesting guy to have watched over the last 20 years 16 since he's writing a book a year on this kind of stuff.</p> <p>17 And, you know, the -- you know, the Darwin End Design, a 18 book that came out in 2003, there he quite explicitly, when 19 he discusses Intelligent Design, he makes the connections 20 with the natural theology tradition, he treats it in a very 21 kind of respectful manner, and in fact he says that, you 22 know, these views that these guys are putting forward these 23 days could be easily confused with kind of respectable 24 scientific views. And that's something you wouldn't -- they 25 wouldn't have said 20 years ago about creation science. You</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">93</p> <p>1 Intelligent Design as something that is mutually exclusive 2 from evolutionary theory. And I understand that because of 3 the nature of the case we're talking about. But within 4 evolutionary theory, within evolutionary theorists, there 5 has -- there have been tendencies in that direction as well. 6 So it's not like Intelligent Design is something completely 7 alien to people who we would normally consider to be 8 contributors to evolutionary theory. I mean, you actually 9 have people, I cite Theodosius Dobzhansky, for example, who's 10 one of the founders of the Neo-Darwinian synthesis who's a 11 geneticist, who quite obviously took Intelligent Design 12 seriously and didn't think of it as being exclusive of 13 evolution. Right. So -- so -- so the thing is that what 14 would be -- yeah. I mean, there is a sense in which the 15 Intelligent Design movement as it's understood today, you 16 know, as this is kind of American phenomena defined by these 17 guys who made the assumptions in association with the 18 Discovery Institute, I mean, there's a sociological way of 19 defining them. Yeah, maybe that form wouldn't exist. But 20 the general ideas and stuff, I mean, are still lurking there 21 in evolutionary theory. And there is stuff that these people 22 have already developed that could be taken, you see. I mean, 23 so -- I'm sorry. I don't know if that answers your question. 24 But I was trying to sort of --</p> <p>25 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p>

24 (Pages 90 to 9

<p style="text-align: right;">94</p> <p>1 Q I want to go through some of the assertions in your report.</p> <p>2 If you could turn to page one, you have a section titled at</p> <p>3 the bottom of the page is evolution fact or theory?</p> <p>4 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>5 Q And if I understand the text that follows correctly, your</p> <p>6 view is that evolution is both a fact and a theory; is that</p> <p>7 fair?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. And when you use the word theory for a scientific</p> <p>10 proposition, do you have a specific definition in mind?</p> <p>11 A Yeah. I basically mean an explanatory conception of a range</p> <p>12 of phenomenon. And also that could serve as the basis for a</p> <p>13 research program, for an empirical research program.</p> <p>14 MR. ROTHSCILD: I'm going to mark as Fuller Exhibit 2</p> <p>15 the Complaint filed in this matter.</p> <p>16 (Marked for identification Fuller Deposition Exhibit</p> <p>17 No. 2)</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Oh, thanks.</p> <p>19 BY MR. ROTHSCILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>20 Q If you could turn to page seven of the Complaint and look at</p> <p>21 paragraph 13.</p> <p>22 A Yeah.</p> <p>23 Q You see in the second line of that paragraph, we have a</p> <p>24 definition from the National Academy of Science - Sciences</p> <p>25 for the word theory?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">96</p> <p>1 because there is no research program generated.</p> <p>2 Q What about creation science?</p> <p>3 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>4 BY MR. ROTHSCILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>5 Q Does that qualify as --</p> <p>6 A No. Not in the -- not in the terms that we were talking</p> <p>7 about earlier.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Now, if we use the National Academy of Sciences</p> <p>9 definition, does evolution qualify as a scientific theory?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Does Intelligent Design?</p> <p>12 A Probably not.</p> <p>13 Q Why not?</p> <p>14 A Well, because it's not well-substantiated. And I think</p> <p>15 that's probably why they define theory this way.</p> <p>16 Q Okay.</p> <p>17 A Because it sort of is prejudicial -- it's sort of -- it's</p> <p>18 quite biased toward a theory that's been around for a long</p> <p>19 time and has been allowed to in fact incorporate lots of</p> <p>20 facts, laws, inferences and so forth, right? It's very</p> <p>21 biased towards an established theory.</p> <p>22 Q Would you agree that the definition in the National</p> <p>23 Academy -- that the National Academy of Sciences uses is more</p> <p>24 rigorous or difficult to satisfy than the definition you use?</p> <p>25 A No. I think they're quite -- they're different kinds of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">95</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q It says in science, a well substantiated explanation of some</p> <p>3 aspect of the natural world that can incorporate facts, laws,</p> <p>4 inferences and tested hypotheses; do you see that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q Is that a definition of scientific theory that you're</p> <p>7 comfortable with?</p> <p>8 A Well, I don't think it has to be well-substantiated, and I</p> <p>9 think it has to provide the basis for a research program. I</p> <p>10 mean, this is too static a definition.</p> <p>11 Q So you don't accept this definition?</p> <p>12 A I don't think it's sufficient.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. You would add the content that it has to assert --</p> <p>14 create the basis for a research program?</p> <p>15 A That's correct.</p> <p>16 Q And you would remove the word well-substantiated?</p> <p>17 A That's right. I don't think that's necessary.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. Using your definition of theory, scientific theory,</p> <p>19 does the theory of evolution qualify?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Does the theory of Intelligent Design qualify?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Does creationism qualify?</p> <p>24 A No, because -- well, not creationism in that six day sense</p> <p>25 were talking about earlier. Presumably that's what you mean</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">97</p> <p>1 definitions in a way. I don't -- I don't see it as more</p> <p>2 rigorous necessarily. Let's put it this way. Their</p> <p>3 definition wouldn't necessarily encourage you to continue</p> <p>4 doing science.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Would you agree that your definition incorporates</p> <p>6 scientific propositions that are early in their -- very early</p> <p>7 in their development, whereas the National Academy of</p> <p>8 Sciences' definition requires that the concept be much more</p> <p>9 developed?</p> <p>10 A Correct. So by this definition, the only thing that counts</p> <p>11 as a theory is a developed theory, by the National Academy of</p> <p>12 Sciences. That strikes me as very strange.</p> <p>13 Q If you go to the top of page two -- and let me just --</p> <p>14 actually, I'm going to read to you, and I'm sorry, I don't</p> <p>15 have an extra copy -- or maybe, actually --</p> <p>16 MR. GILLEN: Want me to make one?</p> <p>17 MR. ROTHSCILD: No, actually, I may have it. Mark this</p> <p>18 as 3.</p> <p>19 (Marked for identification Fuller Deposition Exhibit</p> <p>20 No. 3)</p> <p>21 BY MR. ROTHSCILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>22 Q Fuller -- the document I've marked as Fuller Exhibit 3 is a</p> <p>23 press release issued by the Dover Area School District. And</p> <p>24 you see at the bottom that there is a statement that the</p> <p>25 school district is going to read to students in biology</p>

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

<p style="text-align: right;">98</p> <p>1 class; do you see that?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And at the bottom of the page the statement states, a</p> <p>4 theory is defined as a well tested explanation that unifies a</p> <p>5 broad range of observations. Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Do you accept that as a proper definition of a scientific</p> <p>8 theory?</p> <p>9 A I think I would replace well tested with testable.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. Using your amended definition, is evolution a theory?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Is Intelligent Design?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. Using the definition without your amendment, is</p> <p>15 evolution a theory?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Is Intelligent Design?</p> <p>18 A I don't know.</p> <p>19 Q And is the criteria that calls you to question that the issue</p> <p>20 of well tested?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. Do you -- and you don't have -- you don't know whether</p> <p>23 Intelligent Design can be characterized as well tested?</p> <p>24 A Well, it certainly has been tested, you see. And I think --</p> <p>25 and it is testable. But again, it's this issue of the age of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">100</p> <p>1 the tests that are undergone in science have that quite</p> <p>2 specific character saying I've got a fact, it shows that this</p> <p>3 is right or this is wrong. It's only under very kind of</p> <p>4 controlled conditions you can normally do that sort of thing.</p> <p>5 Otherwise, these tests are of a much more indirect kind,</p> <p>6 where you're providing challenges that you think the theory</p> <p>7 needs to answer to.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. So a couple questions there. Are you aware of any way</p> <p>9 in which Intelligent Design has been empirically tested?</p> <p>10 MR. GILLEN: Objection to form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I'm not. I -- I don't know of any such</p> <p>12 case.</p> <p>13 BY MR. ROTHSCCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>14 Q Okay. You -- I think you're suggesting it has been</p> <p>15 conceptually tested by the -- has been conceptually tested by</p> <p>16 the challenges raised by critics?</p> <p>17 A Yes, yes.</p> <p>18 Q I'm a little troubled by this idea that a concept would</p> <p>19 attain some scientific pedigree as a tested proposition</p> <p>20 solely by the fact that opposing scientists have found</p> <p>21 problems with it. I mean, how does that -- how does that</p> <p>22 advance a scientific concept if all that happens is the</p> <p>23 proponents of the idea raise a concept and, you know, a bunch</p> <p>24 of other scientists demonstrate what's conceptually wrong</p> <p>25 with it?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">99</p> <p>1 the theory because well tested suggests, you know, it's been</p> <p>2 around a while, and it's been tested lots of times in lots of</p> <p>3 different ways. And I don't think that's true, you see. But</p> <p>4 that's not necessarily any fault of the theory itself, you</p> <p>5 see.</p> <p>6 Q How has Intelligent Design been tested at all?</p> <p>7 A Well, I think we were just talking about Dembski, for</p> <p>8 example, right. And we were talking about these</p> <p>9 counterexamples to his definition of the explanatory filter.</p> <p>10 Those counterexamples is a kind of testing at a conceptual</p> <p>11 level, right, because what he's doing is putting forward a</p> <p>12 mathematical formalization of a concept, and here a</p> <p>13 philosopher is coming up with counterexamples showing how it</p> <p>14 doesn't -- how it doesn't apply. So there's a test, right?</p> <p>15 Also, I guess in the case of Behe, trying to come up with</p> <p>16 alternative explanations. You know, so Behe says the only</p> <p>17 way you can explain the way the cell maintains its stability</p> <p>18 is through irreducible complexity, and some evolutionists</p> <p>19 say, no, we've got an alternative explanation. Right. So in</p> <p>20 a sense, the exclusiveness of the explanation being proposed</p> <p>21 has been challenged. These are tests, right? I mean,</p> <p>22 they're -- they're not necessarily tests in the sense of</p> <p>23 coming up with a fact that shows that something is</p> <p>24 definitively right and wrong, but then in science, you know,</p> <p>25 relatively little is actually -- you know, relatively few of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">101</p> <p>1 A Well, first of all, the fact that they bother doing it at</p> <p>2 all, and the terms in which they do it is familiar from other</p> <p>3 things that they are considering in their science, right.</p> <p>4 So, I mean, this is where people like Dembski and Behe are</p> <p>5 really making advances over creation science, if you're</p> <p>6 making that kind of comparison. Namely that they're now</p> <p>7 being answered in the coin of science. Okay. And in a way,</p> <p>8 they're being answered in ways that sort of brings their</p> <p>9 concerns close together to the concerns that are already</p> <p>10 taking place, you know, in other fields of science. So it</p> <p>11 seems to me that this is an implicit acknowledgment of</p> <p>12 bringing them in the scientific ambit. And I don't think we</p> <p>13 should get too fussy about empirical testing, because as more</p> <p>14 and more science gets done on computers and other kinds of</p> <p>15 simulation devices, the idea of there being direct empirical</p> <p>16 tests of things, you know, is going to be increasingly</p> <p>17 limited. I think these kinds of things that we're seeing</p> <p>18 here is going to be much more indicative of the kind of</p> <p>19 science that's going to happen in the future, where you have</p> <p>20 alternative computer models that can generate the same sort</p> <p>21 of phenomena that you can say can only be generated one way.</p> <p>22 And the design guys like to play around with that. And it</p> <p>23 seems to me a lot of science is heading in that direction.</p> <p>24 Q I mean, see, here's my problem. You know, I can come up with</p> <p>25 the assertion that all of biological life is made of</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">102</p> <p>1 Playdough, right?</p> <p>2 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>3 Q And presumably, you know, some smart scientist could</p> <p>4 actually, you know, show what's problematic about that</p> <p>5 assertion, that in fact we know the physical composition of</p> <p>6 Playdough and, you know, we can break it down chemically, and</p> <p>7 then when we look at, you know, the Venus flytrap, or a</p> <p>8 racoon, there's actually almost no similarity in its chemical</p> <p>9 composition, maybe none. And from the way you're describing</p> <p>10 it, then I could say, look, they've tested my proposition.</p> <p>11 I'm science.</p> <p>12 A Well, I mean, a lot depends on what you do afterwards. I</p> <p>13 mean, that's why I think one does have to look -- I mean,</p> <p>14 it's not like once you become a science, or you're becoming</p> <p>15 scientific it's a done deal, you're scientific forever. I</p> <p>16 think one has to see how Dembski and Behe respond to the</p> <p>17 critics, what do they end up coming up with? Do they come up</p> <p>18 with more sophisticated accounts of what they're doing, and</p> <p>19 take the counterexamples into account? Or do they just kind</p> <p>20 of, you know, entrench themselves and just repeat the same</p> <p>21 old stuff that other people have already shown to be false?</p> <p>22 So there is an open question, but this is true of any kind of</p> <p>23 science, right?</p> <p>24 Q So my Playdough example, at the juncture after I've proposed</p> <p>25 it and some smart chemist has shown how problematic it is, I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">104</p> <p>1 debated in the philosophical and scientific literature,</p> <p>2 right, as they put forward more sophisticated versions of</p> <p>3 their theories, then they're operating in a scientific</p> <p>4 manner, even if people continue objecting to them.</p> <p>5 MR. ROTHSCCHILD: Is lunch here?</p> <p>6 MR. GILLEN: Sure.</p> <p>7 MR. ROTHSCCHILD: All right. Why don't we take a break.</p> <p>8 (A brief recess taken at 12:06 p.m.)</p> <p>9 MR. ROTHSCCHILD: Ready, Bob?</p> <p>10 COURT REPORTER: I'm all set, thank you.</p> <p>11 BY MR. ROTHSCCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>12 Q Good afternoon.</p> <p>13 A Good afternoon.</p> <p>14 Q Steve, when -- this morning when we were talking about what</p> <p>15 made Intelligent Design in your view a scientific</p> <p>16 proposition, you said that it satisfied the test of having</p> <p>17 its research trajectory making more of its claims testable;</p> <p>18 does that sound accurate?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Dr. Behe's book Darwin's Black Box came out in 1996.</p> <p>21 And Dr. Dembski's book The Design Inference came out in 1998.</p> <p>22 What -- is it your testimony that since that time their work</p> <p>23 has indeed followed this positive trajectory with more of its</p> <p>24 claims becoming testable?</p> <p>25 A Well, I think that Dembski in particular has refined the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">103</p> <p>1 can claim I'm science, it just might be two years later, if I</p> <p>2 haven't advanced the ball, then I'm not science anymore?</p> <p>3 A Well, then this is why you have to look at the trajectory.</p> <p>4 One wants to know what you do as a result of being given this</p> <p>5 sort of objection. Do you improve your theory of Playdough?</p> <p>6 Do you start to say, ah-ha, there's this micro-Playdough</p> <p>7 stuff that really is what's going on, and explains why you</p> <p>8 saw what you saw, right? And then you have this kind of more</p> <p>9 sophisticated theory, and which then may itself be</p> <p>10 challenged. That's the kind of trajectory one has to</p> <p>11 anticipate here.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. And have we seen Behe or Dembski, you know, continue</p> <p>13 their trajectory? They've -- they're confronted with</p> <p>14 challenges?</p> <p>15 A Well, I mean, I actually think they -- they probably have.</p> <p>16 As I've pointed out, I'm not expert in these guys' work, so I</p> <p>17 don't know what they're doing up to the minute. But I do</p> <p>18 think that what they have run -- what they have begun with is</p> <p>19 something that is itself a scientific improvement over of the</p> <p>20 concepts that they may have gotten, you know, from natural</p> <p>21 theology or something like that. So they've already made the</p> <p>22 first scientific step. You're right. It's an open question.</p> <p>23 But my guess is it's going to happen. I mean, I just don't</p> <p>24 know what's happening at the moment. But I take it that that</p> <p>25 is the way to go. So if you see these guys being further</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">105</p> <p>1 explanatory filter thing in light of criticisms. I mean, he</p> <p>2 still adheres to the notion, but it's a much more, you know,</p> <p>3 fine grained thing, taking into account some of the -- some</p> <p>4 of the counterexamples. I mean, it's -- with regard to</p> <p>5 Behe's work, I think he is trying, but I know that work less</p> <p>6 familiar, the recent work.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. So just with Behe, you can't -- is it fair to say you</p> <p>8 can't make a claim about whether there has been a positive</p> <p>9 research trajectory since the publication of Darwin's Black</p> <p>10 Box?</p> <p>11 A Well, there have been articles. I mean, there have been</p> <p>12 articles. I just have not read them. I mean, some of these</p> <p>13 articles, where Meyer cites them, for example. But I have</p> <p>14 not read them, so I'm not --</p> <p>15 Q So is the answer you can't testify to the fact that there has</p> <p>16 been a positive research trajectory?</p> <p>17 A I -- I cannot, though I do know there has been more research</p> <p>18 done since then by him.</p> <p>19 Q By Behe?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And when you're talking about research, what are you talking</p> <p>22 about?</p> <p>23 A Well, he's trying to -- he's trying to test evolutionary</p> <p>24 explanations of the cell. I mean, there's a sense in which</p> <p>25 he kind of -- it strikes me -- again, see, this is the thing,</p>

106

1 since I haven't read the pieces, I'm only sort of guessing
 2 what I imagine the research strategy is. But I take it that
 3 he's basically trying to show that there's a sense in which
 4 there are certain kinds of phenomena that evolutionary
 5 accounts cannot explain, and so whenever an evolutionary
 6 account is purported, he wants to say, well, in fact they
 7 can't explain everything and that this other account with
 8 irreducible complexity, we'll be able to do that. And so
 9 it's a sort of battle of dueling accounts for various natural
 10 phenomena to get presented. I take it that's kind of -- and
 11 if that is in fact what he's doing, then that would be
 12 scientific. But I'm just -- again, I haven't read the
 13 articles.

14 Q So you don't know?

15 A I don't know. But I do think, you know, I mean, I think it's
 16 reasonable to suppose that that's what he's doing, given that
 17 he's publishing in the area and so forth.

18 Q But you're speculating on what the --

19 A Yes, I'm speculating.

20 Q Okay. And now going to Dr. Dembski, I think what you're
 21 saying is he came up with this concept of the explanatory --
 22 explanatory filter, there's been some criticism of it, he has
 23 adjusted his definition; is that fair?

24 A Yeah, I think that's right. I mean, so he has been
 25 continuing along with the same trajectory, trying to take

107

1 into account the criticism. I think that that's basically --
 2 and that's not surprising.

3 Q Okay. And can you explain what he originated with and how
 4 it's changed?

5 A Well, I mean, in terms of what he originated with, I think he
 6 originally sort of set up something like a, you might say a
 7 menu by which you make the inference that something is design
 8 based, and who you've managed to say that it cannot be
 9 explained by either strict physical regularity or by chance
 10 occurrence. And he listed some conditions one would follow,
 11 and then people brought up counterexamples to this. And he
 12 has adjusted the theory to be able to deal with those
 13 counterexamples. I cannot say whether he's dealt with it
 14 sufficiently that he's going to fend off all counterexamples
 15 in the future. But he is continuing along the same lines,
 16 only a corrected version of it.

17 Q And does this correction fit your definition of a research
 18 trajectory where more of Intelligent Design's claims are made
 19 testable?

20 A Well, yes, in the sense that I think it, you know, it does
 21 open up this field to critics in the future to -- because
 22 he's still sticking with the same method largely, right, so
 23 people are in a sense getting used to the way he operates.
 24 And so it should make it easier in the future to criticize
 25 him, I would think so.

108

1 Q I mean, again, I'm going to come back to this point I think I
 2 was trying to make at the -- this afternoon. That you're
 3 equating the presence of criticism with testability is that
 4 a -- I mean, am I --

5 A That's --

6 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.

7 THE WITNESS: Well, that's -- that's basically correct.
 8 Yes. Yes, that's right, because I think -- I want to move
 9 away from sort of the stereotyping of testability as somehow
 10 coming up with some sort of empirically precise prediction,
 11 let's say during an experiment, because, I mean, that's --
 12 that's a kind of classic paradigm case of how we talk about
 13 scientific testability, but it's not necessarily
 14 representative of all the forms of testability that are used
 15 in science.

16 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:

17 Q Right. And as far as I can tell, the only form of
 18 testability that you have identified for these Intelligent
 19 Design propositions is the fact that they are susceptible to
 20 criticism?

21 MR. GILLEN: Objection to form.

22 THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, you make it sound like
 23 that's mere. I'm not sure what the spirit is in which you're
 24 saying criticism. I mean, first of all, the criticism
 25 isn't -- the criticism comes in rather specific form, right?

109

1 Namely, coming up with counterexamples or coming up with
 2 counter models in the case of Behe, right, which in effect
 3 you know, bring forward various kinds of other considerations
 4 that need to be taken into account. So it's -- you know, the
 5 word criticism shouldn't be reduced to something like
 6 carpeting or something, you know, as if, you know, all's
 7 they're doing is, you know, treating, you know, just sort of
 8 plugging holes. They're in fact engaging with it, right, in
 9 ways that forced Behe and Dembski to sort of, you know,
 10 rethink -- and to varying degrees, what exactly, you know,
 11 how they should proceed after that. So it's not a trivial
 12 thing to do.

13 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:

14 Q Well, and I don't mean to treat it as trivial. But I do --
 15 I'm trying to confirm that in terms of how Behe's and
 16 Dembski's work has been rendered testable, the only real life
 17 examples of that that you are aware of is that the phenomenon
 18 that it's -- they have elicited criticism; is that fair?

19 A Yeah. But, I mean, I'm not sure in the normal run of science
 20 what else you'd be looking for given that most scientific
 21 claims aren't directly testable in that classic, you know,
 22 empirical prediction kind of way that we talk about in
 23 philosophy of science 101. Okay. So I'm not sure what the
 24 alternative that's in the back of your mind would be to
 25 what's happened to them, given the nature of the kinds of

<p style="text-align: right;">110</p> <p>1 claims they're making. So, yes. But I just don't see this</p> <p>2 as damning.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Going back to the Dover statement and your report, you</p> <p>4 write on the -- in first paragraph of page two that the --</p> <p>5 you agree with Ken Miller that the Dover statement is less</p> <p>6 than perspicuous, it seems to conflate theory with opinion.</p> <p>7 What do you mean by that?</p> <p>8 A Well --</p> <p>9 (Mr. Gillen exited deposition room at 1:07 p.m.)</p> <p>10 MR. ROTHSCHILD: You want to wait until Pat's back?</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p> <p>12 (Mr. Gillen reentered deposition room at 1:07 p.m.)</p> <p>13 MR. GILLEN: Thank you. Go ahead.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: What I was referring to was in the first</p> <p>15 of these italicized things on the first page, the first</p> <p>16 italicized paragraph, the biology curriculum is also updated</p> <p>17 to include the following preliminary statement. That it</p> <p>18 seemed to, in a way, I mean, because one of the things that</p> <p>19 Miller was complaining about was the fact that by calling --</p> <p>20 Darwin's theory was being called a theory as a -- of somehow</p> <p>21 to slight it, okay? And I -- and I do think that maybe that</p> <p>22 was something that was going on when that was happening, when</p> <p>23 Darwin's theory was described as theory with a capital T.</p> <p>24 Now, I realize that later on, they then defined theory as a</p> <p>25 well tested explanation that gives it kind of a little more</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">112</p> <p>1 about the statement read to the students?</p> <p>2 A I mean, there's some minor things. I mean -- I mean, so for</p> <p>3 example, this statement does seem to presuppose that the only</p> <p>4 kind of testing that occurs is direct empirical testing,</p> <p>5 right? I mean, at least that's how I read the first sentence</p> <p>6 of the second paragraph, because Darwin's theory is a</p> <p>7 theory -- continues to be tested as new evidence is</p> <p>8 discovered, as if like some fact was going to sort this issue</p> <p>9 out, which I don't think is -- certainly wouldn't be the case</p> <p>10 with these theories at this level of generality, though the</p> <p>11 testing happening at many different levels. Some of them of</p> <p>12 the conceptual kind we've been talking about with Intelligent</p> <p>13 Design. Some of them will involve getting new facts. And so</p> <p>14 a kind of a more nuance notion of testing would have been</p> <p>15 appreciated, I suppose. And then in the final paragraph, the</p> <p>16 fourth paragraph, and maybe this is just something that they</p> <p>17 have to say because they're a school district, but the</p> <p>18 business of what the point of the science class is, to</p> <p>19 achieve proficiency on standard based assessments, it's kind</p> <p>20 of a bit of a downbeat to end this thing, because I would</p> <p>21 have thought that what you'd want to do is actually encourage</p> <p>22 students, you know, to find science fascinating, or</p> <p>23 interesting, or pursue it or something of that kind. And</p> <p>24 given they're going through the trouble of trying to expose</p> <p>25 students to all of these different approaches, you could have</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">111</p> <p>1 significance. But I was agreeing with the fact that the</p> <p>2 statement did look -- did seem to want to denigrate something</p> <p>3 by being called a theory, as if being a fact would be the</p> <p>4 really epistemically significant thing, right?</p> <p>5 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>6 Q And that in fact is not the case? A theory is not going to</p> <p>7 graduate into a fact, right?</p> <p>8 A Right. Exactly, exactly. Exactly. No, I mean -- and I do</p> <p>9 think there is -- that the tone of the statement is a little</p> <p>10 confusing. I mean, so I'm agreeing with Miller on that</p> <p>11 point.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Is there anything about the -- and let me just</p> <p>13 distinguish here, we have two italicized portions in this</p> <p>14 document. One is the one paragraph item which is what is</p> <p>15 included in the biology curriculum.</p> <p>16 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>17 Q And then the second, four paragraph italicized item is what</p> <p>18 is actually read to students?</p> <p>19 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. And let's start with the -- the statement read to</p> <p>21 students, so that's the second italicized item, the four</p> <p>22 paragraph item.</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Other than what you just identified about the use of the word</p> <p>25 theory, is there anything else that you find problematic</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">113</p> <p>1 thought they could have said that that was the reason they</p> <p>2 were doing it.</p> <p>3 Q Oh, my, you've been away from the United States too long. In</p> <p>4 this section about evolution being fact or theory, in the</p> <p>5 second full paragraph, which begins, evolution names both a</p> <p>6 fact and a theory, going to the bottom of that paragraph, you</p> <p>7 say, when Miller and Robert Pennock seized upon ID</p> <p>8 aspirations to change the ground rules of science in their</p> <p>9 expert reports, they have caught sight of these more</p> <p>10 fundamental differences in orientation. What did you mean by</p> <p>11 that?</p> <p>12 A Well, I think the -- the sort of the range of phenomena in</p> <p>13 evidence and explanatory thrust of ID and Neo-Darwinism are</p> <p>14 somewhat different. So in a sense, I think it's a bit</p> <p>15 misleading to say that they are competing -- that they're --</p> <p>16 that they're literally competing to explain all the same</p> <p>17 phenomena. I mean, there's a sense in which they're sort of</p> <p>18 approaching overlapping -- they're approaching roughly the</p> <p>19 same stuff, but with sort of different conceptions of what's</p> <p>20 an appropriate way of going about studying it, largely</p> <p>21 because they are somewhat -- there's a sense in which they're</p> <p>22 different conceptions of how science is to be understood in</p> <p>23 general between the two. I mean, I do think it's fair to say</p> <p>24 that the Intelligent Design people in a sense are aspiring to</p> <p>25 a kind of an ultimate science of intelligence you might say.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">114</p> <p>1 And this is where our information theory and all this stuff, 2 and the explanatory filter as a potentially universalizable 3 conception that can be applied across all disciplines, not 4 just to biology, becomes very important.</p> <p>5 And that idea of using the concept of intelligence as a 6 covering device for all science is obviously not -- is not 7 presumed or considered necessary by Neo-Darwinism, which, you 8 know, is operating on a somewhat different level with these 9 matters, and quite focused on the nature of life, the nature 10 of life on earth in fact. And the other thing, too, about 11 Intelligent Design, it's not necessarily kind of just located 12 on earth. I mean, it's -- potentially, the cosmos is its 13 purview. So, I mean, so there's a sense in which these 14 theories are really aspiring to do somewhat different things, 15 but are obviously overlapping in the phenomena of the nature 16 of life and so forth. So they have a lot of common ground in 17 terms of what they need to explain, but their approaches are 18 really quite different. I mean, the fact for -- I mean, if 19 you think about the development of theory within evolutionary 20 biology, this idea of mathematically specifying, you know, 21 the probability of something is something that happens 22 relatively late in the development of evolutionary biology, 23 whereas this is the kind of like the first move Dembski 24 makes, right? So it gives you a sense of a different kind of 25 take on how one goes about explaining things.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">116</p> <p>1 A Yeah. I understand. No, no, no. No. But I -- I understand 2 the way they understand it. Namely, right when -- when 3 people like Pennock, for example, talk about scientists being 4 cre -- committed to methodological naturalism, right, and 5 some of these very fundamental notions which are in a sense, 6 perhaps, as it were, accurate as a kind of dominant views of 7 what's taking place in professional sciences today, right, 8 it's quite clear that Intelligent Design is certainly 9 challenging that. Right. So all these kinds of built-in 10 assumptions about how disciplines are divided up, for 11 example, so that in principle, Intelligent Design theory is a 12 theory that would, I think, unify certain branches of 13 physics, perhaps cosmology, with the sorts of areas we 14 normally consider under biology. And so you can find 15 analogous Intelligent Design arguments in cosmology today. 16 mean, this is why in earlier response to your question about, 17 you know, if you got rid of Behe and Dembski, would there be 18 Intelligent Design? Well, you know, in other places -- other 19 fields, like in physics, there's evidence of similar lines of 20 thinking being pursued there with the anthropic principle of 21 Barrow and Tippler, Paul Davies, all these kinds of guys in 22 physics, it seems to me are sort of barking up the same tree 23 as well. And I think, you know, that would obviously lead to 24 a different conception of science. One where physics and 25 biology aren't so far apart from each other the way they are</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">115</p> <p>1 Also the, you know, it's also showing the different 2 trainings of the people who are involved in these fields. 3 You know, Dembski's a mathematician, and Behe's a biochemist. 4 I mean, that -- that -- that's -- you know, from the history 5 of Darwinism, those are rather exotic origins for people to 6 have come from to be interested in the nature of life. So 7 there are all these kinds of differences, right, that give 8 different orientations as to what science is about. And so 9 that would obviously involve changing the ground rules of 10 science because there's a sense in which you would change the 11 scope of what you're talking about, because if what you're 12 really concerned about is the nature of Intelligent Design as 13 such, with life being one example of that, as opposed to 14 being interested in the nature of life regardless of whether 15 it's Intelligent Design or not, right, you're going to have 16 different ways of pursuing the inquiry.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. So you -- you agree that Intelligent Design aspires to 18 change the ground rules of science?</p> <p>19 A Yeah, I think that's fair to say. I think -- I think they 20 certainly -- yes.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. And -- and what are the ground rules of science that 22 you're talking about?</p> <p>23 A Well, I'm using their expression. I didn't invent this 24 expression. This is Miller and --</p> <p>25 Q Right. But then you agreed, so now I get to ask you.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">117</p> <p>1 today, and where cosmology and evolution are seen much more 2 connected together.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. You use the term methodological naturalism. What do 4 you mean by that?</p> <p>5 A Well, this is a term that I believe Pennock uses. And this 6 is the idea that in order to do science, right, you have to 7 be committed to a kind of naturalistic world view. That is 8 to say, everything happens in nature according to principles 9 of material causation.</p> <p>10 Q And you said that that's the dominant view in science today, 11 correct?</p> <p>12 A I -- I think it -- you know, from the standpoint of asking 13 scientists kind of what's your underlying principles, yes. I 14 mean, whether it's necessary for them to continue their work 15 is another matter. But I think it -- you know, it's kind of 16 as we're off the shelf ideology, yeah.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And there's -- the dominant view of scientists 18 practicing science is to limit themselves to the principles 19 of methodological naturalism?</p> <p>20 A Yes, I think that's right. I think that's what they think 21 they're doing, I think that's what they think they're doing, 22 yes.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And changing that framework is one of the -- I mean, 24 is that one of the ground rules of science that ID aspires to 25 change?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">118</p> <p>1 A Yes, yes. That's right.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And you also -- you used the term in your report</p> <p>3 metaphysical naturalism?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q What do you mean by that?</p> <p>6 A Well, what methodological naturalism is in practice.</p> <p>7 Q And explain what you mean by that.</p> <p>8 A Well, I think -- see, naturalism is not an innocent view.</p> <p>9 Right. I mean, one of the consequences of methodological</p> <p>10 naturalism is that you sort of presuppose the world has to be</p> <p>11 a certain way in order for science to take place. So you</p> <p>12 restrict yourself to certain kinds of, you know, phenomena</p> <p>13 and ways of looking at the phenomena and close yourself off</p> <p>14 to other possibilities. So you close yourself off to</p> <p>15 Intelligent Design. And in the past, this kind of naturalism</p> <p>16 closed people off to looking at things like action at a</p> <p>17 distance with regard to gravitation attraction in Newtonian</p> <p>18 mechanics. And in -- even arguably, people say that if you</p> <p>19 really took this kind of methodological naturalism seriously,</p> <p>20 you wouldn't be able to make much sense of quantum mechanics</p> <p>21 as it currently is being made sense of, because that in a</p> <p>22 sense spends at least certain kinds of common sensical</p> <p>23 notions of physical causation that are normally seen as</p> <p>24 rooted in methodological naturalism. So in that sense,</p> <p>25 there's a kind of metaphysics that's associated with it. It</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">120</p> <p>1 words, I don't think it's so -- you know. I don't think, you</p> <p>2 know, you can't -- I don't really know if there's a moment in</p> <p>3 Intelligent Design work where you say, ah, you know, you're</p> <p>4 now entering the supernatural here. You now need a</p> <p>5 supernatural explanation. I mean, that's kind of more a term</p> <p>6 a critic would use of it.</p> <p>7 Q Well, let me -- when --</p> <p>8 A So is Intelligent Design supernatural? Right? I mean -- I</p> <p>9 mean, certainly when the arguments are being conducted about</p> <p>10 it, you know, let's say to Dembski's version, the word</p> <p>11 supernatural doesn't have to arise, but it's quite clear the</p> <p>12 kinds of inferences he's making do take us beyond what</p> <p>13 normally is accepted within naturalistic forms of science.</p> <p>14 Q When we talk about Intelligent Design, do you understand</p> <p>15 Intelligent Design to take a position on who the intelligent</p> <p>16 designer is?</p> <p>17 A Not necessarily, though, I mean, historically, of course, a</p> <p>18 certain kind of monotheistic conception of God has been</p> <p>19 behind it. But I don't think the way the theories have been</p> <p>20 developed recently you'd really require any kind of view on</p> <p>21 this matter, that one could be agnostic. Yeah.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And do you have an understanding of whether</p> <p>23 Intelligent Design takes a position on what the capabilities</p> <p>24 or powers of the Intelligent Design is -- designer is?</p> <p>25 A Well, this is, again, I don't think there's any kind of --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">119</p> <p>1 closes you off to appreciating certain kinds of phenomena.</p> <p>2 So in a sense, calling it methodological is a bit coy.</p> <p>3 That's what I would say. I'm using the term because that's</p> <p>4 the term Pennock, I believe, introduces. I myself would see</p> <p>5 naturalism as a metaphysical position.</p> <p>6 Q So to you, methodological naturalism and metaphysical</p> <p>7 naturalism or philosophical naturalism aren't really</p> <p>8 distinct --</p> <p>9 A That's right.</p> <p>10 Q -- concepts?</p> <p>11 A That's correct.</p> <p>12 Q At -- certainly at the end of your report, and I think</p> <p>13 elsewhere, you say that ID rejects naturalism and is</p> <p>14 committed to supernaturalism, right?</p> <p>15 A Well, I think if you're going to take that kind of</p> <p>16 distinction seriously, because I mean, the point I made about</p> <p>17 the naturalism/supernatural distinction is that it's a --</p> <p>18 distinction created by naturalists, right, who in effect --</p> <p>19 who in effect say, look, these people aren't just considering</p> <p>20 sort of the normal material world in which things operate,</p> <p>21 but they also think there's this other stuff out there,</p> <p>22 Intelligent Design or spirits or something like this. And --</p> <p>23 and so that's the supernatural realm. I think actually my</p> <p>24 view about what Intelligent Design people are doing is</p> <p>25 actually kind of blurring the boundary more. So in other</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">121</p> <p>1 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I don't think there's any kind of uniform</p> <p>3 view on this matter. And in that respect, it's very much</p> <p>4 led -- I mean, this respect -- you know. There's a sense in</p> <p>5 which, look, the intelligent designer in a sense has to be</p> <p>6 intelligent enough to produce, you know, a cell, let's say,</p> <p>7 that has some kind of organic -- you know, stability over</p> <p>8 many different environmental changes. So it has to be that</p> <p>9 powerful or that intelligent. But does it have -- but it</p> <p>10 doesn't have to be infinitely powerful or intelligent. So in</p> <p>11 that respect, it is not committed to the fully robust notions</p> <p>12 of the divine creator that have been associated with the</p> <p>13 Judeo-Christian tradition. Right. You could actually --</p> <p>14 it's quite compatible with a much more restricted sense of</p> <p>15 intelligent designer.</p> <p>16 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>17 Q Do you understand the intelligent designer, its proponents</p> <p>18 have provided any description of what capabilities the</p> <p>19 intelligent designer has or would need to have to do the</p> <p>20 things that they say it has done?</p> <p>21 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Well, it all depends how you -- I mean</p> <p>23 look. There's a sense in which -- one of the reasons why</p> <p>24 Intelligent Design has been able to be critically discussed</p> <p>25 by other scientists and philosophers has been because they</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">122</p> <p>1 have managed to characterize their theory in a way that</p> <p>2 doesn't make sense to the properties of the intelligent</p> <p>3 designer. And so as a result as it were, they have contained</p> <p>4 their own discourse so as not to go into that direction,</p> <p>5 which would normally be seen as a sort of positive benefit of</p> <p>6 scientific, rigorous, methodological direction. I mean, it's</p> <p>7 something that they should be -- they -- they -- should be</p> <p>8 regarded positively, the fact that they don't have to go into</p> <p>9 a discussion of God in order to be able to talk about what</p> <p>10 their position is and get criticized for it. But I do think</p> <p>11 where you see evidence as it were of what the intelligent</p> <p>12 designer is about is when one starts talking about</p> <p>13 constraints, right, the whole idea of, you know, you might</p> <p>14 say what -- you know, the -- the limits of the mind of God</p> <p>15 are -- are as it were the probability constraints within</p> <p>16 which the explanatory filter can occur in Dembski. Okay.</p> <p>17 That would be one way of talking about the parameters of the</p> <p>18 mind of God if you will. But you don't need to talk about</p> <p>19 mind or God to actually have a decent argument about this</p> <p>20 topic.</p> <p>21 BY MR. ROTHSCCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>22 Q But isn't -- isn't the -- how can you talk about the</p> <p>23 probability that's entailed in the explanatory filter if you</p> <p>24 have no information about what kind of designer you're</p> <p>25 talking about?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">124</p> <p>1 that issue. But I take it that that would in fact be the way</p> <p>2 to go.</p> <p>3 BY MR. ROTHSCCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>4 Q Has Intelligent Design succeeded in changing the ground rule</p> <p>5 of science?</p> <p>6 A Well, if you mean this in a statistical sense like are more</p> <p>7 scientists now inclined to believe Intelligent Design than</p> <p>8 not believe it, the answer is no, of course. But I do think</p> <p>9 they have shifted the burden of proof a bit and in terms of</p> <p>10 making people more open-minded. And I think also providing</p> <p>11 an entire for -- I mean, I'll give you an example what I</p> <p>12 think they've done. When Michael Ruse wrote that book,</p> <p>13 Darwin and Design, I think that was the first of his books</p> <p>14 where he starts talking about complexity theory and the kind</p> <p>15 of computer modeling of self-organizing phenomena that was</p> <p>16 often presented as a kind of potential criticism of</p> <p>17 evolutionary theory. All the stuff being done in the Santa</p> <p>18 Fe Institute by Stuart Kauffman, people like that.</p> <p>19 And the way Ruse presents it is basically, look, the</p> <p>20 Intelligent Design people have a very extreme version of this</p> <p>21 idea. And so -- and so in a way to immunize yourself against</p> <p>22 what Intelligent Design might come up about, you should take</p> <p>23 complexity theory seriously. Okay. So in a sense what</p> <p>24 he's -- what they've done indirectly is kind of opened the</p> <p>25 door to cognate points of view that are more respectable but</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">123</p> <p>1 A Well, because, right, the presupposition of the model is that</p> <p>2 there is a kind of universal conception of design that</p> <p>3 applies not just to God but applies to us when we design</p> <p>4 things. And we know kind of what we're like. Right? And so</p> <p>5 that's kind of as it were the empirical baseline to operate</p> <p>6 from. But it's what's presupposed is a kind of</p> <p>7 universalizable conception of designer that isn't -- that</p> <p>8 doesn't just rely on God. Okay. I mean that we too have</p> <p>9 this.</p> <p>10 Q But do you understand Dembski's explanatory filter to build</p> <p>11 its probabilities from the probabilities that humans could</p> <p>12 design?</p> <p>13 A I think that's -- I think that -- that, in a sense, that is</p> <p>14 part of the initial intentions, I think, come from that.</p> <p>15 Just like very much with Paley.</p> <p>16 Q But does his explanatory filter base its probability -- its</p> <p>17 determination of the probability of Intelligent Design of</p> <p>18 biological life on the capabilities of Intelligent Design</p> <p>19 that we know to exist in humans?</p> <p>20 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Well, I think -- I think the literal</p> <p>22 answer to your question is probably yes if -- if Dembski</p> <p>23 actually went around explaining biological life which, of</p> <p>24 course, as we were already discussing earlier, he hasn't</p> <p>25 really done that. Okay. I mean, he -- he's kind of coy on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">125</p> <p>1 in the past really haven't been considered very close to</p> <p>2 evolutionary theory. So they have done a little bit of</p> <p>3 shifting around. I think they've also made the business of</p> <p>4 doing computer simulations more interesting for biological</p> <p>5 research. But again, you know, I'm not going to say these</p> <p>6 are like deep determining effects. But on the margins, I</p> <p>7 think they've had some influence in the way in which people</p> <p>8 are conceptualizing how evolutionary biology needs to be</p> <p>9 assessed.</p> <p>10 Q So it's your understanding that Stuart Kauffman's work on</p> <p>11 complexity theory arose in any way in response to Intelligent</p> <p>12 Design?</p> <p>13 A No. But from similar concerns that natural selection can't</p> <p>14 explain changes in the nature of life, right. And he's</p> <p>15 someone who believes that there are mathematically</p> <p>16 specifiable parameters, right, which are necessary in order</p> <p>17 for any kind of life to get off the ground even before</p> <p>18 natural selection gets on the scene. Now, insofar as he</p> <p>19 holds that assumption, that assumption is very similar to the</p> <p>20 assumption of Intelligent Design people. Of course, he takes</p> <p>21 it in a different direction, he doesn't really talk about</p> <p>22 God. But I can tell you this. I mean, people who are very</p> <p>23 die-hard natural selection people like Daniel Dennett, you</p> <p>24 know, true -- you know, sort of true believer Darwinists,</p> <p>25 they're very scared of Stuart Kauffman for actually giving</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">126</p> <p>1 the impression that something like -- like, you know,</p> <p>2 Intelligent Design might -- might be able to have some</p> <p>3 repro-shmault with evolutionary theory.</p> <p>4 Q Did you agree that Intelligent Design involves consideration</p> <p>5 of supernatural actors?</p> <p>6 A It certainly allows the possibility. They don't actually</p> <p>7 tell you much detail about them, so it's not like they have</p> <p>8 some great theory of the supernatural.</p> <p>9 Q Right. But the intelligent designer they're talking about is</p> <p>10 not being represented as a creature known to us in the</p> <p>11 natural world, correct?</p> <p>12 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Yeah, insofar as it's discussed openly,</p> <p>14 that's correct, I think.</p> <p>15 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>16 Q Okay. In Penrock's report, he states that there's no</p> <p>17 evidence in the scientific literature that supernatural</p> <p>18 hypotheses are being considered, and it's hard to imagine how</p> <p>19 that could possibly change without undermining the very</p> <p>20 notion of empirical evidence. Do you agree with that</p> <p>21 statement?</p> <p>22 A No. I mean, because I think it's based on a -- on a sort of</p> <p>23 a leading definition of what supernatural -- I mean, because</p> <p>24 it -- there are some people who will say that a lot of</p> <p>25 aspects of quantum phenomena have supernatural qualities</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">128</p> <p>1 did make some sense of phenomena. And then people said,</p> <p>2 well, what could this be? Newton says that things are being</p> <p>3 pulled by some mysterious fashion. When in fact we all know</p> <p>4 that in the material world, motion happens through contact</p> <p>5 between objects. And here's Newton saying the exact</p> <p>6 opposite's happening. How could this be? Well, it took a</p> <p>7 long time to sort of figure out. And I'll say this. The</p> <p>8 supernatural hypothesis kept going for a while, and then it</p> <p>9 got naturalized, right. So now we talk about gravitation</p> <p>10 without worrying about action at a distance as somehow</p> <p>11 disturbing our notions of nature. But the super -- but</p> <p>12 having this kind of occult thing was really quite important</p> <p>13 for motivating research -- research and physics for, you</p> <p>14 know, a good 100, 150 years. So, I mean, it's -- there's --</p> <p>15 see, the point is being supernatural and dealing with -- and</p> <p>16 being scientific are somewhat separate issues. And a lot has</p> <p>17 to do with how you test -- how you deal with the hypotheses</p> <p>18 of being proposed as supernatural. It doesn't have to do</p> <p>19 with the content of it as supernatural per se. So you can</p> <p>20 deal with the paranormal in a completely spooky fashion, and</p> <p>21 say, oh, I just believe it no matter what happens, or you can</p> <p>22 deal with it scientifically by trying to design experiments</p> <p>23 that might actually try to show it exists.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And you say in your report that ID proponents believe</p> <p>25 precisely that specific supernatural explanations are</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">127</p> <p>1 it if we kind of understand natural to be common sensical</p> <p>2 forms of physical causation, for example. I mean, so there's</p> <p>3 an issue about what -- where the boundary's being drawn here.</p> <p>4 And insofar as there's still research on things like</p> <p>5 paranormal phenomena, which do involve experiments and about</p> <p>6 things that because they involve some kind of action at a</p> <p>7 distance, where the physical causation is not by any means</p> <p>8 clear, but you're nevertheless doing experiments on this</p> <p>9 stuff, you know, it's supernatural and it doesn't undermine</p> <p>10 the empirical foundations of science.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. So you think there is scientific research being</p> <p>12 done --</p> <p>13 A On things that --</p> <p>14 Q -- supernatural hypotheses?</p> <p>15 A On what one could reasonably call supernatural. Certainly</p> <p>16 there's experiments being done on the paranormal, yeah. And</p> <p>17 in the past, of course, supernatural entities have been</p> <p>18 entertained within science.</p> <p>19 Q In what past?</p> <p>20 A Well, for example, if you look at Newton's theory of</p> <p>21 gravitation, okay, which -- action at a distance. That was</p> <p>22 originally -- I mean, the word that was used was occult. It</p> <p>23 was an occult entity because, you know, how could this thing</p> <p>24 happen? All that -- all that Newton had, kind of a bit like</p> <p>25 Dembski, was a kind of mathematical equation that actually</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">129</p> <p>1 testable?</p> <p>2 A Yes. That's the point, yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. But you have not been able to identify any experiments</p> <p>4 that they do or have proposed, correct?</p> <p>5 MR. GILLEN: Objection.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: No, they haven't done -- not in the strict</p> <p>7 sense, no. They have made various plausibility arguments</p> <p>8 and, you know, as it were, you know, you might say, proto</p> <p>9 pre-experiments, you know, that kind of thing. Thought</p> <p>10 experiments perhaps you might call them. But, no, they</p> <p>11 haven't done experiments in the sense that we do experiments</p> <p>12 on paranormal phenomena where the people can guess what the</p> <p>13 cards are and things like that. No, they haven't done</p> <p>14 anything like that.</p> <p>15 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And you say right after that in your report that ID</p> <p>17 proponents also wish to draw corroborating testimony from the</p> <p>18 viable but crucially this forms a diminishing proportion of</p> <p>19 ID's argumentative arsenal. Taking the first piece of that,</p> <p>20 what are you talking about when you say that ID proponents</p> <p>21 wish to draw corroborating testimony from the Bible?</p> <p>22 A Well, again, I think of people like Phillip Johnson who</p> <p>23 periodically will kind of make allusions, usually kind of</p> <p>24 just almost like an emotional appeal. I mean, not really in</p> <p>25 a way that you would call evidential appeal, but kind of an</p>

130

1 emotional appeal about the righteousness of this kind of
 2 stuff. So there is that. I mean, and insofar -- I mean, he
 3 is -- he has been very supportive of the Intelligent Design
 4 movement so I wanted to, as it were, acknowledge that that
 5 does exist.

6 Q Do you understand Dembski to be doing anything similar?

7 A I believe Dembski has written some pieces which do have this
 8 character, but they're not the piece -- but they're somewhat
 9 separate in terms of where they're located. So maybe
 10 something -- maybe something that was even on the website of
 11 the Discovery Institute that he published may have a bit of
 12 this flavor to it. But not the stuff that I've ever seen him
 13 in the more professional publications.

14 Q And why do you say it performs a diminishing proportion of
 15 ID's argumentative arsenal?

16 A Well, you just don't see it in writing -- you just don't see
 17 it anymore. I mean, you don't see any appeals to the Bible.
 18 You would never -- I mean, in fact, unless you know the
 19 history of all this, you'd never guess by the way this stuff
 20 is being argued today that the Bible played any role at all.

21 Q Do you have any concern that that absence of religious
 22 reference so to speak is tactical rather than scientific?

23 A Well, if it lasts long enough, it becomes substantive, right.
 24 I mean, because at the very least, even if it is tactical and
 25 that the only places they're discussing religion is somewhere

131

1 else, not in the classroom, not in their textbooks, not in
 2 the public forum but in Sunday school or something like that,
 3 after a while what that does is it institutionalizes a sharp
 4 distinction between religion and science, like it or not.

5 Q If it was the objective of the individuals who are developing
 6 Intelligent Design to come up with a religious science, or a
 7 science that comports with their religious convictions, would
 8 that be problematic for you in terms of judging whether there
 9 is a -- truly a scientific program going on?

10 A No, because science at the end of the day has to be with
 11 testability. People can have whatever religious motives they
 12 want. Okay. And in the philosophy of science, I mean, in
 13 connection with the demarcation problem, we make a
 14 distinction. It's an old distinction but it's a valid one in
 15 this context. The context of discovery versus context of
 16 justification. If you look at the -- the context of
 17 discovery has to do with the motivation that people have for
 18 coming up with various scientific hypotheses. And as we note
 19 through history, especially the history of the west, religion
 20 has played a very important role consistently. Various
 21 religious beliefs. Because, you know, Christianity comes in
 22 many flavors, and Judaism, and Islam and all this. And
 23 people have been motivated in different ways, depending on
 24 where they're coming from on the religious map. But at the
 25 end of the day, what makes it science is the context of

132

1 justification which has to do with how you test a theory,
 2 right? Do you do it by these publicly, methodologically
 3 accessible criteria? Do you refine your -- your theory in
 4 response to criticism over time regardless of where the
 5 criticism's coming from, so you hold different religious
 6 beliefs than me, I do an experiment, you criticize my
 7 experiment, I don't ask what your religious beliefs are. I
 8 just change my -- my theory so that I avoid your criticism.
 9 Okay. And that's how it becomes science, is once it moves
 10 into the context of justification. So the fact that these
 11 people have all these religious beliefs doesn't bother me at
 12 all. What I look for is whether they treat these beliefs
 13 scientifically in terms of submitting them to sort of the
 14 rigorous, methodological tests. And so that's the key thing.
 15 So the fact that people who don't share Dembski's or Behe's
 16 beliefs are criticizing them in a way that they would
 17 criticize other scientific colleagues is, for me, a very good
 18 sign. And I don't care how religious they are, when -- you
 19 know. But in -- in -- in -- in the court of criticism,
 20 everybody's equal. And that's what makes it scientific.

21 Q Do you draw a distinction between the fact that some of the
 22 scientists are very religious, which is true of many
 23 evolutionary --

24 A Yeah.

25 Q Evolutionary scientists as well and professions that they are

133

1 attempting to develop science that is consistent with their
 2 religious beliefs. I mean, is that significant to you?

3 A I'm trying to get a grip on the question here. Let me see.
 4 Can you rephrase it a little bit?

5 Q Well, one can imagine that there are scientists who are
 6 extremely religious, but the only way you would know that
 7 that's so is you would go to their place of worship.

8 A Yes, yes. Yes.

9 Q And then there might be scientists who say, I want to develop
 10 science that comports with my religious belief. That's my
 11 objective, that's why I'm doing this. Does -- if a scientist
 12 fell in that second category, is that significant to you in
 13 terms of judging the merits of the scientific enterprise?

14 A I understand. The answer is how that second scientist goes
 15 about trying to get a science that conforms to his religious
 16 beliefs, because if the way he does it is through dogmatism,
 17 you know, and forcing people, you know, to read certain
 18 textbooks and so forth, indoctrination, cultishness, if
 19 that's the way he does it, okay, then it's bad news, it's
 20 not -- it's not science. But if the way he does it is, you
 21 know, is say, look, you know, I -- you know, I believe in the
 22 science and I want you to believe in the science because I
 23 believe in this conception of God, but the way -- but I want
 24 you to test this, can you do this experiment yourself? Will
 25 you come up with these results? See, if you look at somebody

<p style="text-align: right;">134</p> <p>1 like Sir Isaac Newton, for example, and he's writing in a 2 period where if -- you know, people are still quite open 3 about talking about their religion and science in the same 4 sentence, he makes it very clear what kind of God he believes 5 in. But at the same time, he's also got a mathematically 6 specifiable theory that you can test for yourself as it were, 7 and -- and you -- and -- and -- and you can buy it or not buy 8 it, and you can do so without accepting whatever heavy 9 religious thing he laces the theory with in its pages. And 10 that's -- so at the end of day for me it's how you proceed, 11 how you proceed to develop the theory. You can -- you could 12 state your religious beliefs as loudly as you want. But -- 13 but as long as you're testing them in ways that don't require 14 that you hold those beliefs. See, that's the thing. The 15 testing of the beliefs have to require an independence of 16 mind. But the fact that the people who are putting forward 17 the hypothesis to test happen to have very strong religious 18 beliefs that they actually announce, that itself should not 19 be a problem.</p> <p>20 Q In terms of -- I think what I understand you to be saying is 21 that religious affiliation, even religious motivation is not 22 significant if the scientist goes about their enterprise in a 23 religiously neutral way; is that fair?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q And one significant way you have identified for doing that is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">136</p> <p>1 relevant critical community is co-extensive with the peer 2 review process. However, if what you're trying to do is 3 change the ground rules of science, then it's not clear. I 4 mean, peer review has a much more ambiguous role, especially 5 given the types of deformations that the peer review is 6 subject to, whereby there's a kind of resistance to new 7 things. And so, you see, when people like -- when the 8 Intelligent Design people look like they're avoiding peer 9 review process, I think there's a genuine problem about 10 exactly who is the relevant form for judging these things, 11 right? And I'm not saying that necessarily plays to their 12 benefit either because there is an open question if you 13 cannot figure out who can test this thing, then is it really 14 testable? Fair question. But interestingly enough the stuff 15 is being tested, and at least by the philosophers, right? So 16 there's a -- at a certain conceptual level, right, there are 17 people who are registering that there is something there, 18 because after all, Dembski's book was -- was criticized 19 severely and he responded to it in the leading peer reviewed 20 journal, in the Philosophy of Science. Now, probably Dembski 21 thinks, you know, he has bigger fish to fry than philosophers 22 of science. But the point is that, you know, that's a peer 23 reviewed publication of a recognized professional society 24 where his arguments were taken very seriously. Okay. So he 25 did find a peer review outlet for this, okay? So it's not</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">135</p> <p>1 to develop the proposition in a way that it can be tested?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q And then test it?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Is another indicia of that independent or religiously neutral 6 scientific enterprise that the proponents of it submit their 7 propositions to the scientific community?</p> <p>8 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Yes, yes. But, again, are you -- I mean, 10 in a sense, I almost take this to be a restatement of the 11 first point. But -- but you want to draw a distinction here?</p> <p>12 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>13 Q Well, I mean, let me -- I'll -- I'll -- I'll give an example 14 of it. Would it -- would you consider it an indicia of this 15 sort of religiously neutral, independent scientific 16 enterprise that the individuals developing the science submit 17 their propositions to scientific -- peer reviewed scientific 18 journals?</p> <p>19 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: It depends. The issue is easier to solve 21 if these people are doing normal science, because then, as it 22 were, the relevant peers are clearly identified, right, 23 because they're working within a form of science that already 24 has well defined boundaries and they're trying to make a 25 contribution to that. And so, therefore, as it were, the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">137</p> <p>1 like these guys can't find any peer reviewed things. But I 2 do think there is a kind of difficulty there in knowing 3 exactly who is eligible to test what you're saying.</p> <p>4 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>5 Q Would you at least expect that -- well, let's take an example 6 like Professor Behe's work, that is dealing at it -- you 7 know, as you said, sort of bottom up?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q With the structure of the cell.</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q And making certain -- drawing certain conclusions or 12 inferences from the structure of the cell, is that fair?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q And that's -- falls within the field of molecular biology?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. Would you expect that -- that that kind of work would 17 then belong -- should be submitted to journals dealing with 18 molecular biology?</p> <p>19 A Yes. But -- okay. Here's the issue. First of all, some of 20 the work has been submitted, not very much. And the response 21 to it is again the problem of when you're trying to do 22 something different because I think the tenor of most of the 23 responses to Behe has been along the lines of we really need 24 irreducible complexity, we've got our own ways of explaining 25 what's going on with the cell. So thank you very much,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">138</p> <p>1 right? And that's not surprising because Behe is trying to 2 kind of come up with an alternative science. And peer review 3 processes are designed for promoting normal sciences that are 4 already on the ground. So not surprisingly they're going to 5 say, look, we can -- we can explain what you're talking 6 about, we don't need your competing explanation. That 7 doesn't mean his explanation is false. It just means that 8 from the standpoint of the way in which normal science is 9 conducted, it's not very useful.</p> <p>10 But if he wants to come up with an alternative 11 science -- which is presumably what he wants to do in a 12 sense -- then he -- you know, he's got to launch his own 13 research program. I mean, and that's where it becomes 14 important to have a clear sense of what these guys' research 15 program is, where are they going with this. Because 16 otherwise, then you would just say, oh, it's just parasitic 17 on what evolutionists are doing, which is a critique you 18 often get in Intelligent Design. But if you can show that 19 these people have a positive research program, they're 20 pursuing their own research, going in their own direction, 21 the fact that it can't get published in peer review journals 22 in molecular biology as it's traditionally understood is not 23 itself a problem.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. But right now as you understand it, there is neither a 25 robust record of peer reviewed publications, nor a robust</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">140</p> <p>1 A Well, I mean, it depends how fast you think things ought to 2 take. I mean, you know, the time it took to go from Darwin's 3 Origin of the Species, to the Neo-Darwinian synthesis, right, 4 was from 1860 to let's say 1930, 1940, with a quarter of a 5 century in the middle where people thought Darwinism was dead 6 when genetics first came up. Okay. That's the history of 7 Darwinism for the first half of its life. Okay. I mean, you 8 know, if that's the benchmark, then you see, then I think we 9 ought to be a bit lenient about Intelligent Design.</p> <p>10 Q And what -- I raise the point, Steve, not because it -- I'm 11 trying to assert something about what Intelligent Design 12 might become long after, you know, we've, you know, gone to 13 dust. What I'm -- what I'm raising the question is given its 14 primitive condition, why would you -- why would it be taught 15 to ninth graders?</p> <p>16 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Well, precisely for this reason. Namely, 18 we're talking about how to take science forward in the 19 future. And it seems to me that we sort of betray kind of 20 the open-mindedness that we take to be -- you know, we take 21 science to exemplify as a hallmark of our civilization if we 22 don't -- you know, if we don't present students with the 23 possibility that science is something that's still very open 24 for very fundamental forms of inquiry. And the best way to 25 do that is to show how one might study something like life</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">139</p> <p>1 research program?</p> <p>2 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>3 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>4 Q Is that fair?</p> <p>5 A I think the research program is in its early stages. Okay.</p> <p>6 I mean, that's a little different than robust.</p> <p>7 Q Okay.</p> <p>8 A And I think, yes, the peer review record is not robust. I 9 think nobody would deny that. I don't think they deny it 10 either.</p> <p>11 Q And in the case of a research program, I mean, you can't 12 identify any empirical research that's being done using 13 irreducible complexity or using the explanatory filter, 14 correct?</p> <p>15 A Well, I mean, the theories are being developed, right? I 16 mean, Dembski has been making his refinements and I think 17 Behe has been doing research, but I'm just not -- I don't 18 have firsthand familiarity with it.</p> <p>19 Q And here's what -- you know, Steve, what I'm troubled with is 20 that I think it's the case that -- I think you would agree 21 with me that you would characterize Intelligent Design as in 22 its relative infancy; that there's some people doing some 23 thinking about it, thinking hard about it, they've come up 24 with some ideas, and that it really hasn't moved much beyond 25 that. It might, but right now it hasn't; is that fair?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">141</p> <p>1 starting with fundamentally different assumptions from the 2 taken for granted view, because otherwise we're stuck with 3 just teaching dogma science. It's sort of defeating the 4 whole kind of open -- openness of science, what makes it such 5 an exciting and important field. I would have thought from a 6 pedagogical standpoint you would want to expose people to 7 kind of new views that haven't been fully explored yet 8 because it gives something for them to do that's kind of 9 exciting, rather than just filling in the puzzle of something 10 that's already been established for several generations.</p> <p>11 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>12 Q Now, you've read the statement that they're going to read to 13 the Dover students, right?</p> <p>14 A Uh-huh. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. And --</p> <p>16 A Well, look at the fourth paragraph, right?</p> <p>17 Q Right. Okay. I want you to look at the text right below the 18 statement.</p> <p>19 A Okay.</p> <p>20 Q And it says, the Superintendent, Dr. Richard Nusen, has 21 directed that no teacher will teach Intelligent Design, 22 creationism, or present his or her or the board's religious 23 beliefs, right?</p> <p>24 A Uh-huh. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q How is the objective you just discussed accomplished if</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">142</p> <p>1 students are simply being told here's Intelligent Design, but</p> <p>2 then they're not allowed to discuss it?</p> <p>3 A I didn't -- well, I'm endorsing this view. I'm not</p> <p>4 responsible for this view. I don't -- at least as far as I</p> <p>5 understand, I don't endorse this.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. You -- so you -- the Dover policy of simply making</p> <p>7 students -- of telling students about Intelligent Design but</p> <p>8 then not allowing them -- allowing the teacher to talk about</p> <p>9 it doesn't accomplish the objective?</p> <p>10 A It defeats the purpose, yes. That's true. Yes.</p> <p>11 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Okay. I'd like to mark as Fuller</p> <p>12 Exhibit 4 -- let's see if I have a stapled version.</p> <p>13 (Marked for identification Fuller Deposition Exhibit</p> <p>14 No. 4)</p> <p>15 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>16 Q Do you recognize the document I've marked as Exhibit 4?</p> <p>17 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>18 Q And what is that?</p> <p>19 A It is a report I wrote following a global cyberconference I</p> <p>20 did on public understanding of science, I believe it was</p> <p>21 1998. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And is this project you're describing in this article</p> <p>23 sort of representative of the work you do in social</p> <p>24 epistemology?</p> <p>25 A It's a kind of applied side of it you might say, yes, because</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">144</p> <p>1 of that kind. We call in scientists actually to sort this</p> <p>2 stuff out for us. People are not -- the people who are</p> <p>3 governed by these scientifically derived rules are not</p> <p>4 normally consulted or involved in the process. And this kind</p> <p>5 of issue starts to become more and more important as people</p> <p>6 perceive that there are more and more scientifically</p> <p>7 generated threats and hazards in the society. And in a</p> <p>8 sense, they want to get involved participating in decision</p> <p>9 making concerning science and so forth. And so in that</p> <p>10 sense, they want to behave more like citizens of a nation</p> <p>11 rather than, you know, being under a monarch, where science</p> <p>12 is the monarch in this case.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And, you know, you use the phrase science is the</p> <p>14 monarch. Who's science?</p> <p>15 A Well, I'm talking about like the National Academy of</p> <p>16 Science. Right. So we're not talking about all rank and</p> <p>17 file scientists, because in fact depending on where you are</p> <p>18 institutionally in science, you hold different types of</p> <p>19 viewpoints, okay, about how science should be used and so</p> <p>20 forth. But I'm talking about the sort of the people, the</p> <p>21 main disciplinary people. Right. The people who run the</p> <p>22 professional societies, who run the National Academy of</p> <p>23 Sciences, which tend to keep a kind of monolithic view of</p> <p>24 what science is about.</p> <p>25 Q Are there risky alternatives, and I'll raise one example.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">143</p> <p>1 it tries to bring different people together and so forth.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And if you go to the second page of the document which</p> <p>3 is page 330 of the article, there's a section entitled</p> <p>4 intellectual motivation for the cyberconference; do you see</p> <p>5 that?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. And I take it the point of this conference is to</p> <p>8 discuss public understanding of science?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And towards the bottom of the first paragraph of that</p> <p>11 section, this concept with the acronym PUS?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q Is --</p> <p>14 A That's public understanding of science.</p> <p>15 Q Yes. Stated can be understood as symptomatic of a crisis in</p> <p>16 scientific representation, akin to subjects of a monarch who</p> <p>17 wish to be regarded as citizens of a nation, but have yet to</p> <p>18 identify an effective political vehicle for its realization.</p> <p>19 Can you explain what you're trying to convey there?</p> <p>20 A Okay. Well, the idea being that in the modern period at</p> <p>21 least, science has had a kind of uni -- sort of unilateral,</p> <p>22 maybe monolithic authority over, well, political opinion</p> <p>23 and -- and in all kinds of other respects, and in a sense, is</p> <p>24 supposed to stand for all of society in terms of, you know,</p> <p>25 for example, providing food, health, safety standards, things</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">145</p> <p>1 You know, we talked about global warming. And, you know, for</p> <p>2 example, we see in the present American presidential</p> <p>3 administration that scientists come to gather data and come</p> <p>4 to conclusions about the state of global warming, and then</p> <p>5 we're led to understand by some quarters that political</p> <p>6 considerations, you know, effectively suppress that</p> <p>7 scientific information. I mean, is that -- isn't that the</p> <p>8 risk of the alternative you're suggesting?</p> <p>9 A I mean, I think what you're saying is true. But that doesn't</p> <p>10 mean that therefore there's global warming, okay? I mean, I</p> <p>11 think what we do lack is a sort of -- a general and full,</p> <p>12 open discussion. So you're right, I'm not going to deny that</p> <p>13 there has been the suppression of scientific information. But</p> <p>14 just making the scientific information known doesn't</p> <p>15 necessarily resolve the issue. So there's a sense in which</p> <p>16 one needs to think about what is the appropriate forum in</p> <p>17 which these different opinions concerning global warming</p> <p>18 should be articulated and discussed, and then decisions</p> <p>19 taken. I think that's kind of more the issue. It's not like</p> <p>20 we kind of already know the answer but it's being suppressed</p> <p>21 by politicians.</p> <p>22 Q And then if you go to the next page, page 331, you have a</p> <p>23 discussion of American's discussion of PUS --</p> <p>24 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>25 Q -- having been more open to matters, being more open</p>

146

1 including to the incorporation of religiously inspired
2 doctrines, for example, Intelligent Design theory, a/k/a
3 creationism into mainstream science education. Do you see
4 that?

5 A Uh-huh, uh-huh.

6 Q And that's consistent with what you told me today, which is
7 that Intelligent Design theory is a form of creationism?

8 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.

9 THE WITNESS: But it's -- no. But it's not all of
10 creationism, and it's in fact the part of creationism that
11 gets taken into science. So, I mean, I mean, obviously, I'm
12 just -- because in the time that this piece was written,
13 right, so this was written in 1998, Intelligent Design theory
14 wasn't that widely used as an expression. So I put the
15 creationism in there so people kind of have a sense of what
16 exactly Intelligent Design is without me having to give a
17 whole song and dance about it, because I'm just using it as
18 an example. But I didn't mean to say that everything about
19 Intelligent Design corresponds to everything about
20 creationism.

21 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:

22 Q But you -- what do you understand the acronym a/k/a to mean?

23 A Yeah, also known as.

24 Q Okay. So --

25 A Right. But in 1998, okay, we're talking -- you know, when

147

1 did Dembski's book come out? 1998? I mean -- right? I
2 mean, we're talking pretty early before this thing becomes
3 really crystalized as something that's separable from all
4 these different branches of creationism.

5 Q So you're saying in 1998, Intelligent Design was more similar
6 to creationism than it is today?

7 MR. GILLEN: Objection to form.

8 THE WITNESS: I'm not actually -- I'm not actually
9 making any commitment to that in this parenthesis. I'm just
10 using it as a marker so that people can understand what
11 Intelligent Design -- since Intelligent Design theory was an
12 ascendant notion, what exactly -- how -- you know, in what
13 conceptual space one should put that when thinking about what
14 religiously inspired doctrines mean.

15 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:

16 Q Okay. And Intelligent Design -- you were characterizing
17 Intelligent Design theory as a religiously inspired doctrine?

18 A Well, it is, and to a certain extent is religiously inspired.
19 But to be religiously inspired is not to be religion.

20 Q Okay. And -- and you were equating it with creationism?

21 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.

22 THE WITNESS: I wasn't equating it. I wasn't equating
23 it. All right. I mean, I was just -- I was using it as a
24 kind of -- as a placeholder for it in a period where this
25 term Intelligent Design wasn't yet consolidated in the way it

148

1 is now. Had I written this thing today, I would not put it
2 this way. I mean, these things are time sensitive. In that
3 respect, Intelligent Design has made progress fairly rapidly
4 because in the course of whatever this is, seven years since
5 this piece has been published, right, the status of this
6 thing has changed somewhat.

7 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:

8 Q And in what respect?

9 A Well, in the sense that I think it's more easily
10 disentangleable. So like even when you were talking about
11 Intelligent Design theory, you were able to nail it down to
12 few people, right, who are in a way separable from the
13 general creation movement. And I think that -- you know.
14 And I think that that's because of all the, you know, not
15 just the publication of the books, but also the way in which
16 the discussion of Intelligent Design has kind of moved off
17 its own space. So in a sense, you can talk all about
18 Intelligent Design now without bringing in all the other
19 schools of creationism, or the six -- you know, the six day
20 stuff or any of that.

21 Q But that was not true in 1998?

22 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.

23 THE WITNESS: I think in 1998 these things were much
24 more confused.

25 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:

149

1 Q Okay. Confused by who?

2 A Well, I just mean just generally speaking.

3 Q You for one?

4 A Look, I didn't say I was a creationist or Intelligent Design
5 theorist. But I do think that -- I do -- I do find -- I have
6 found out more about it in the interim, I think it's fair to
7 say that I knew less about it back then. Largely because
8 there was less of it to know, okay. And I know more about
9 now. But again, this is seven years ago.

10 Q Okay. Now, when I asked you about this before, you said
11 you'd been following this issue?

12 A Not -- I mean, but I never said I was an expert on this. I
13 said I was following it, you know, kind of shadowing it.
14 That doesn't mean I'm an expert on it.

15 Q I mean, you know, these -- Steve, words are pretty hard to
16 escape. Religiously inspired doctrine a/k/a creationism.
17 And I think -- what I'm trying to understand is, you know,
18 what about Intelligent Design caused you to characterize
19 it -- characterize it as --

20 A Well, because --

21 Q -- Creationism at the time?

22 A Because all of the response -- look. All of the responses to
23 Behe and Dembski and the line of argument that that led --
24 led from to the present day happened after this. I mean,
25 there is a sense in which, you know, if you want to -- if you

<p style="text-align: right;">150</p> <p>1 were -- if you ask the question what evidence is there that</p> <p>2 Intelligent Design is making this transition from metaphysics</p> <p>3 to science, the fact that, you know, I would never write a</p> <p>4 statement like that today because things have changed in the</p> <p>5 seven years. Okay. And I didn't say -- you know, I mean,</p> <p>6 and maybe I did an injustice to Intelligent Design theory</p> <p>7 back in 1998 because I hadn't -- you know, I hadn't read</p> <p>8 Behe's book which was already out. I mean, that's entirely</p> <p>9 possible. That may well be true.</p> <p>10 Q Going to the -- to the back of the document, the second to</p> <p>11 the last page -- third to the last page, sorry, 339.</p> <p>12 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>13 Q You have an appendix that lists titles of opening statements.</p> <p>14 And one of them is telling the difference between science and</p> <p>15 religion. Do you have a recollection of what that was about?</p> <p>16 A Okay. One thing to point out is that these statements,</p> <p>17 because I've done two global cyberconferences. In the first</p> <p>18 one, I did not write -- I mean, write the opening statements.</p> <p>19 I did that in the second one. So I'm not sure who wrote this</p> <p>20 first opening statement. It may have been John Angus</p> <p>21 Campbell, it may have been him. I mean, that is one</p> <p>22 possibility.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. Speaking of John Angus Campbell, you had an essay or</p> <p>24 article that was published in the book he and Stephen Meyer</p> <p>25 edited called Darwinism, Design and Public Education?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">152</p> <p>1 A Obviously, I was starting to think about Intelligent Design</p> <p>2 back then.</p> <p>3 Q So I take it you had some familiarity with Intelligent Design</p> <p>4 at the time you wrote the article?</p> <p>5 A I guess so, yes.</p> <p>6 Q And if you flip to page 536, the second full paragraph you</p> <p>7 talk about the idea that creationism has inherited Lamarck's</p> <p>8 charge may seem strange until we consider particular articles</p> <p>9 in this volume, and you refer to Stephen Meyer and Michael</p> <p>10 Behe's article. So, I mean, I guess the first thing to</p> <p>11 clarify is, I'm a little confused about sort of the timing</p> <p>12 here.</p> <p>13 A Were they in the original journal article, you're asking?</p> <p>14 Q Yes.</p> <p>15 A I think they were because I don't -- I don't actually recall</p> <p>16 substantially revising this.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. So you were, in this article written in 1998,</p> <p>18 referring to articles by Dr. Meyer and Professor Behe about</p> <p>19 Intelligent Design that you believe were also written in 1998</p> <p>20 or sooner?</p> <p>21 A That's right, yes, because there was a special issue of that</p> <p>22 journal that was basically the launch pad for the volume.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And you say the idea that creation has inherited</p> <p>24 Lamarck's charge may seem strange until we consider</p> <p>25 particular articles in this volume, and then you refer to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">151</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And that book was -- I think it published in 2003?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q And your article which I'm going to mark as an exhibit was</p> <p>5 titled, An Intelligent Person's Guide to Intelligent Design</p> <p>6 Theory?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Did you come up with that title?</p> <p>9 A Yes, yes, yes.</p> <p>10 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Let's mark that as the next exhibit.</p> <p>11 (Marked for identification Fuller Deposition Exhibit</p> <p>12 No. 5)</p> <p>13 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>14 Q Was this article published in any other forum before it</p> <p>15 was --</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q -- part of the book?</p> <p>18 A Yes. In fact, it was originally published in Rhetoric and</p> <p>19 Public Affairs, which is a peer reviewed journal in, I guess,</p> <p>20 Texas A and M.</p> <p>21 Q And do you remember when it was published?</p> <p>22 A My vitae would have that, if you'll just give me a moment.</p> <p>23 Q Sure.</p> <p>24 A Here it is. 1998.</p> <p>25 Q Okay.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">153</p> <p>1 those two articles. And I'm interpreting that to be labeling</p> <p>2 Meyer and Behe's articles as examples of creationism, is that</p> <p>3 fair?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. So again, at this time, in your view, you consider</p> <p>6 Intelligent Design as creationism?</p> <p>7 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I mean, again, it seems to me that I'm</p> <p>9 using it in this very general kind of way that's not</p> <p>10 presupposing that all of them hold the same views.</p> <p>11 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>12 Q I'm not suggesting it is. In what sense -- I mean, I</p> <p>13 understand that you certainly are not suggesting that, for</p> <p>14 example, this work or Intelligent Design work is, as a</p> <p>15 general matter, creationist in the sense that it requires</p> <p>16 belief in a six day creation?</p> <p>17 A That's right, or biblical literalism or anything of that</p> <p>18 kind.</p> <p>19 Q Okay.</p> <p>20 A No. So it's not that kind of creationism.</p> <p>21 Q But clearly, you are indicating that Intelligent Design is</p> <p>22 creationism in some sense?</p> <p>23 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: It is a -- it does have roots in that. I</p> <p>25 mean, Intelligent Design is a way of interpreting</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">154</p> <p>1 creationism, that's true.</p> <p>2 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And what aspects of -- what do you mean by creationism</p> <p>4 when you say Intelligent Design does have roots in</p> <p>5 creationism or is creationist?</p> <p>6 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, the motivation. The</p> <p>8 motivation for putting forward Intelligent Design is from</p> <p>9 people who do think that there is a divine creator. I mean,</p> <p>10 I think historically, that's been the case. And I think it's</p> <p>11 probably true of these people. But again, what makes it</p> <p>12 science isn't that fact. I mean, again, all kinds of</p> <p>13 religious motivations inform science. I mean, so there's</p> <p>14 nothing, in a sense by calling it creationism what I'm doing</p> <p>15 is I'm giving something about the motivation of the people</p> <p>16 but not necessarily about the scientific status of what</p> <p>17 they're doing. Those are two separate issues. You've got</p> <p>18 context of discovery, context of justification.</p> <p>19 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>20 Q Okay. And so when you -- when you refer to this Intelligent</p> <p>21 Design work as creationist, do you -- do you mean it only in</p> <p>22 the sense that it's motivated by creationist interest?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And not anything about the content of Intelligent</p> <p>25 Design?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">156</p> <p>1 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>2 Q Could you turn to page 538 of the article. In the first full</p> <p>3 paragraph, you say, my tentative approval notwithstanding,</p> <p>4 Meyer's view raises its own questions, one theological -- one</p> <p>5 theological and the other more strictly scientific. You say,</p> <p>6 is it reasonable or even nonblasphemous to suppose that God</p> <p>7 is the ultimate artificer? Artificer? And you go on to talk</p> <p>8 about Meyer's willingness to subvert the significance of the</p> <p>9 boundary between biological and mechanical forms of</p> <p>10 intelligence being intellectually bracing. And then it goes</p> <p>11 on. Can you explain what you're getting at here?</p> <p>12 A Well, I mean, in a sense what I'm bringing up is a kind of</p> <p>13 concern that actually you were bringing up earlier. I see</p> <p>14 you get your ideas from good places. Namely, this business</p> <p>15 of just because we can -- even if we can understand how human</p> <p>16 beings create things, why should we think this is any kind of</p> <p>17 model for understanding how God does things? And let alone</p> <p>18 how life is created. So, yes, that's the -- that is the</p> <p>19 objection I'm raising here.</p> <p>20 Q And I think -- I think you understand -- I understand that at</p> <p>21 one level you're raising that, that that's a theological</p> <p>22 problem?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q That we -- it's blasphemous to suggest that, you know, what</p> <p>25 we know about ourselves and what we can do is in any way a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">155</p> <p>1 A No, because in fact these people in practice don't actually</p> <p>2 say much about the qualities of the creator, right. I mean,</p> <p>3 in that sense, they don't do a lot of the stuff of</p> <p>4 traditional creationism.</p> <p>5 Q They do suggest that the designer is a supernatural creator,</p> <p>6 correct?</p> <p>7 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, yes. But that's not saying</p> <p>9 a lot, you see. I mean, I just don't think that's saying</p> <p>10 very much. I think --</p> <p>11 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>12 Q Do you -- go ahead.</p> <p>13 A No, no, no, you go ahead.</p> <p>14 Q Do you consider that an aspect of creationism; that a -- that</p> <p>15 there is a -- that the explanations of life include a</p> <p>16 supernatural creator?</p> <p>17 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Yes. I think creationism does presuppose</p> <p>19 that the creator is separate from the creation, in which case</p> <p>20 it is supernatural. Yes. I mean, so yes. I mean, it's</p> <p>21 attached to a certain kind of cosmology which does involve a</p> <p>22 difference between the creator and the created. So it's</p> <p>23 true, supernatural in that sense. But again, I don't see</p> <p>24 this as operating in a way that actually, in some way</p> <p>25 vitiates the science that's being done.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">157</p> <p>1 model for God; is that right?</p> <p>2 A Yes, yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Is that -- do you also -- are you also suggesting that</p> <p>4 that argument is scientifically problematic?</p> <p>5 A Well, I don't seem to say that here, do I? No, no. The</p> <p>6 scientific side is a different argument, isn't it, right?</p> <p>7 Because there's two arguments here, right? There's a</p> <p>8 theological argument which is what we're talking about, but</p> <p>9 then there is also a scientific issue.</p> <p>10 Q Right, which is separate?</p> <p>11 A Yeah.</p> <p>12 Q Do you find the first argument which you focus on</p> <p>13 theologically --</p> <p>14 A Yeah.</p> <p>15 Q -- also to be scientifically problematic? Because I can't</p> <p>16 get over it.</p> <p>17 A I -- see, my attitude toward this has changed a bit over the</p> <p>18 last seven years, okay? I mean, I guess I would have said</p> <p>19 yes back then, that it was problematic. But now I think there</p> <p>20 there's a sense in which, as so much -- I've mentioned this</p> <p>21 earlier. So much of science goes on to be done as computer</p> <p>22 simulations, where the scientists in a sense has to be</p> <p>23 something an artificer, and that includes when one is trying</p> <p>24 to model the nature of life and the way in which life</p> <p>25 develops and so forth, I think it actually becomes easier to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">158</p> <p>1 sort of put oneself in the mindset of what a -- of how a</p> <p>2 creator would create things. So I think it's not as</p> <p>3 far-fetched now as it was before.</p> <p>4 Q And so you've gone to this point a few times, I want to make</p> <p>5 sure I understand it. Are you suggesting that our ability to</p> <p>6 intelligently model the development of life in effect</p> <p>7 demonstrates or puts us in the shoes of a potential</p> <p>8 supernatural creator?</p> <p>9 A I think -- I think it certainly makes it easier to sort of</p> <p>10 think about what such a creator would do. So if one were</p> <p>11 approaching projects like Dembski's explanatory filter thing,</p> <p>12 I mean, I happen to believe that that project of Dembski's</p> <p>13 will probably at some point be taken out of Intelligent</p> <p>14 Design proper and it actually be made much more mainstream</p> <p>15 science as part of a general -- as design become more taken</p> <p>16 on-board, as we do more and more of our science on computer</p> <p>17 simulations. I mean, in that respect, I think science is</p> <p>18 changing, the grounds rules are kind of changing. Not</p> <p>19 necessarily because people are believing Intelligent Design,</p> <p>20 what's going on there, but because the way we do science is</p> <p>21 changing, and that we're doing more of it on computer</p> <p>22 simulations and that does put us in the position of an</p> <p>23 artificer more, and to think in terms of what kinds of</p> <p>24 constraints and parameters, and then, as it were, testing</p> <p>25 things by the kinds of worlds we produce as a result of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">160</p> <p>1 it's not like I had a revelation or something that made me</p> <p>2 see that this -- this is kind of a conclusion I draw from the</p> <p>3 way in which science -- the contemporary practice of science</p> <p>4 is changing. I mean, see, the point -- the background point</p> <p>5 here is that throughout the history of science, so many of</p> <p>6 our models for understanding the world have been drawn from</p> <p>7 the technologies that we used in our everyday lives and for</p> <p>8 studying science itself. So, for example, as soon as the</p> <p>9 dynamo was created in the 19th Century, everybody thought</p> <p>10 that energy and generators were the stuff of life, and</p> <p>11 thermodynamics became the big thing. And largely,</p> <p>12 thermodynamics is just an abstract modeling of what an</p> <p>13 electric generator does, right, and how it gets energy and so</p> <p>14 forth. And so similarly, as computers become more and more</p> <p>15 integral to the way in which science is done in everyday life</p> <p>16 is done, I don't think -- and programming becomes more</p> <p>17 normal, people do their own programming, as that becomes more</p> <p>18 common, then I think this kind of design approach to things</p> <p>19 generally will gain greater credibility and make these more</p> <p>20 extreme design arguments seem more plausible than they do now</p> <p>21 because it becomes easier to think with. It becomes easier</p> <p>22 to think about. I mean, one of the problems with design</p> <p>23 arguments in the past was that because they were neither</p> <p>24 attached to anything terribly quantitative, and there was no</p> <p>25 technological way of really realizing them, they seemed very</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">159</p> <p>1 operating with certain constraints and parameters. And that</p> <p>2 seems to me very much in the spirit of the kind of thing</p> <p>3 Dembski's doing, and we're doing more and more of our science</p> <p>4 in computers, which kind of puts you in the mindset to be</p> <p>5 able to think that way. So I do think that there is -- that</p> <p>6 it is more plausible now. I mean, I real -- as more and more</p> <p>7 science migrates to computer simulations, I do think so. I</p> <p>8 mean, back then, I maybe didn't think so. But these -- I</p> <p>9 mean, I've read John Horgan's The End of Science, and there</p> <p>10 are other things that lead me to think that. So I don't</p> <p>11 think it's so implausible.</p> <p>12 Q Is there anything besides our capacity to simulate biological</p> <p>13 or other physical events with computers, is there anything</p> <p>14 besides that that causes you -- that has caused you to shift</p> <p>15 your view about whether Meyer's assertion there is</p> <p>16 scientifically problematic or not?</p> <p>17 A That particular -- this particular thing he's saying, so</p> <p>18 we're not talking about all Intelligent Design, but just what</p> <p>19 he's just saying here. That's probably the main thing. I</p> <p>20 mean, I'm not -- I guess I'm not one -- yeah, I am. I think</p> <p>21 there's a sense in which these are still at the level of</p> <p>22 conceptual points. So it's not like I would be looking for</p> <p>23 some kind of evidence or something that will have made this</p> <p>24 more plausible in any strict sense. And because I don't</p> <p>25 think of these matters in particularly theological terms,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">161</p> <p>1 abstract and metaphysical in that kind of bad sense, it</p> <p>2 couldn't be turned into scientific. But now we -- we're in a</p> <p>3 kind of situation.</p> <p>4 Q See, and I still don't understand that because, I mean, I</p> <p>5 think we've agreed that in the case of Intelligent Design, it</p> <p>6 does not include any description of who the designer is,</p> <p>7 correct?</p> <p>8 A Correct.</p> <p>9 Q What its capabilities are?</p> <p>10 A Correct.</p> <p>11 Q What its motive are?</p> <p>12 A Correct.</p> <p>13 Q So I'm sure how -- I'm not sure I understand -- I'm not sure</p> <p>14 I understand how --</p> <p>15 A Well, the --</p> <p>16 Q If you could please just let me finish, how a human's</p> <p>17 modeling through computer simulation of what -- how aspects</p> <p>18 of physical life have occurred could be in any way connected</p> <p>19 to this sort of inchoate designer?</p> <p>20 A Well, okay. Let me correct something I said earlier. I</p> <p>21 mean, what I think the computer program does allow you to do</p> <p>22 with regard to potential creator is a sense of not maybe the</p> <p>23 full power of the creator, that is to say, everything the</p> <p>24 creator could do, but rather the constraints under which the</p> <p>25 creator in fact operates when creating things. That's</p>

162

1 something I think the computer can give you a very good sense
 2 of. And that's kind of the principle behind the explanatory
 3 filter, it seems to me. This idea of what are the
 4 consequences of laying down certain constraints, certain
 5 parameters within which then you allow things to develop.
 6 And I think computers really allow us a lot of capacity to do
 7 that. And that can get us in the mindset that's necessary to
 8 think about, you know, how worlds get created. At the end of
 9 the day, I don't think we're going to be able to figure out,
 10 you know, all the powers that God had or something like that.
 11 I don't think computer programming is going to be putting you
 12 in that state of mind. But I think it does enable us to
 13 think of the business of constraints within which creation
 14 can happen, which is very much an important part of the
 15 design inference. I think computers are very good in
 16 sensitizing you and forcing you to think about that in a very
 17 concrete kind of way.

18 Q Steve, I'm getting the sense, and you tell me if I'm right or
 19 wrong, that as you sit here today, you think the modern
 20 theory of evolution is a better explanation of biological
 21 life than Intelligent Design currently is; is that fair?

22 A Yes. But I am dissatisfied with it. But yes, that's true.

23 Q Okay. You're dissatisfied with it because?

24 A I do think a lot of these issues, the Intelligent Design
 25 people raise, and not just them, but also the complexity

163

1 theorists like Krafftman and others, about the idea that there
 2 are constraints on the possibility for life, right, that
 3 exists independently of what natural selection does, I think
 4 that's a serious issue that needs to be addressed. And in a
 5 sense, the Intelligent Design people have made that a very
 6 vivid problem. And that goes beyond just showing that there
 7 are gaps in evolutionary theory. That's actually trying to
 8 get us to sort of think about the issues a little bit
 9 differently. And so that's, in a sense, where I would rate
 10 Intelligent Design, and why I think it's good to teach to
 11 kids, because it kind of fuels the imagination in a way. So,
 12 you know, I mean, I think it'd be great to teach Intelligent
 13 Design in conjunction with certain kinds of computer
 14 programming where kids learn how to simulate worlds and stuff
 15 like that. I mean, I think that would be a very good content
 16 to bring that up and maybe do something with Dembski's
 17 explanatory filters there. You see, I mean, so that's kind
 18 of where I think -- where I think Intelligent Design is
 19 promising in a way to fuel the imagination. But if you're
 20 just asking at the moment right now, who explains, you know,
 21 biological phenomena better, evolutionary theory does. It's
 22 been around longer. It kind of controls the field in a way
 23 in the sense that you can't actually generate as it were
 24 approved biological phenomena unless you've been accredited
 25 as an evolutionary biologist, I mean, more or less. And so

164

1 it's not surprising that that's the situation. And my view
 2 about that is why not have another bunch of people who in a
 3 sense bring a somewhat different or overlapping, but not
 4 identical set of skills and sort of frame the problems a
 5 little bit differently, try to get at the same sorts of
 6 issues? Why not do that? I mean, this is -- it's in that
 7 context that I think Intelligent Design is worth pursuing.
 8 But not because it's really kind of matched evolution.

9 Q It hasn't matched evolution. You haven't come to the
 10 conclusion that it's correct?

11 A No, I haven't.

12 Q Okay.

13 A No, I'm just saying it's worth pursuing. That a different
 14 issue.

15 Q Well, fair to say that you are skeptical about whether there
 16 is actually supernatural explanations for the history of
 17 biological life?

18 A What I would say is that I think history shows that
 19 supernatural explanations are very fruitful, but in the
 20 long-term become naturalized. So -- and that's a very
 21 important point because, again, if we're thinking about
 22 motivating people to do science, the fact that explanations
 23 turn out to be naturalistic in the end doesn't mean that you
 24 should have people starting off always thinking
 25 naturalistically. Rather there may be some advantage in

165

1 thinking in the supernatural way that, in a sense, there's
 2 some kind of radical sort of sense of reality that we're
 3 omitting from our theories and our ways of doing science, and
 4 that we need some different way of doing things. That has
 5 been fruitful in the past. Not always, but it has -- it --
 6 there is -- there is track record for this. And -- and --
 7 and so -- and I think that needs to be encouraged in a way.
 8 And in a sense, from that standpoint, naturalism seems
 9 incredibly dogmatic and restrictive, especially when we're
 10 thinking about the future of science, you know, with our
 11 kids.

12 Q Is it fair to say you're coming at this issue, your
 13 attraction to this issue is in large part because you think
 14 that the scientific establishment has become dogmatic about
 15 it?

16 A Yes, I think so. I mean, the fact that we have this lawsuit
 17 is a good example. Right? I mean, yes. I think so. And
 18 I -- and I think so especially on the biological front, more
 19 so than in the physics front, maybe because there are these
 20 very -- you know, these very politicized issues that this
 21 stuff can crystalize at, like these debates over textbooks
 22 and things like that. But I do think the evolutionary
 23 biologists are overplaying their hand here, and they're not
 24 doing themselves any good by trying to restrict sort of the
 25 free trade of ideas in their field.

<p style="text-align: right;">166</p> <p>1 Q Continuing your article, page 539, you have your conclusion, 2 creationism's rhetorical virtuosity. And you say, I have no 3 doubt that virtually any position in the philosophy of 4 science can be used as a rhetorical resource to challenge the 5 scientific establishment. What do you mean by that? 6 A Well, I mean, in the sense that philosophical positions, 7 especially once they become recognizably philosophical, tend 8 to be developed kind of independently of this -- you know, 9 the science that they were originally associated with. So in 10 a sense, they can be used as sort of rhetorical markers, 11 right? So people holding opposite views can actually appeal 12 to the same kinds of philosophical views. I mean, this 13 happens with the demarcation criterion with all kinds of 14 views. 15 Q And then you go onto say Meyer, for example, appeals to an 16 especially strong form of scientific realism, inference to 17 the best explanation, to combat the evolutionists. 18 A Yes. 19 Q What do you mean by that? 20 A Okay. There is this -- there is this force -- okay. So 21 scientific realism basically says science is trying to come 22 up with a picture of ultimate reality. Kind of in its 23 most -- in its maximally coherent comprehensive sense. And 24 you might say the paradigm case of this is Newtonian 25 mechanics, which try to -- you know, explain all the physical</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">168</p> <p>1 my theory is the only way that can explain it. You guys can 2 only explain part of it. 3 Q And let's -- let's talk about that in the sense of the 4 irreducible complexity. And I think -- I think what you said 5 is, if I understood you correctly, is sort of it's the best 6 that -- or tell me if you agree with this, that what Behe's 7 saying is I can -- by using the proposition of irreducible 8 complexity, I'm demonstrating that Intelligent Design is 9 better explanation than those other explanations that are out 10 there? 11 A Yes. 12 Q Okay. And obviously, the most sort of prominent of those 13 explanations in terms of biological life would be random 14 mutations and natural selection -- 15 A Yes. 16 Q -- correct? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And he's saying that's not an adequate explanation for what 19 I'm saying? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Therefore, Intelligent Design is the best explanation? 22 A Yes, that's roughly what's going on. 23 Q Okay. And obviously, we know there's been a number of 24 challenges to sort of the first part of that, that a lot of 25 critics have said, no, irreducible complexity really doesn't</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">167</p> <p>1 phenomena by the smallest set of laws. So, you know, and 2 and -- and you want -- and so what you want to say, that no 3 other explanation could have done it as well as Newton's 4 could have. And so typically, this -- this involves trying 5 to have lots of different things explained by kind of 6 covering principle. And, well, this is kind of what Meyer is 7 doing, right? Meyer is trying to do this kind of thing. 8 Q What do you mean by inference to the best explanation? 9 A Oh, well, the point is that no other explanation could 10 provide as good an explanation. That there's a kind of, as 11 it were, the kinds of things that you're trying to explain 12 together, I mean, it's a bit like irreducible -- irreducible 13 complexity is a great example of inference to the best 14 explanation. Namely, if you say that a cell is this thing 15 that hangs together in this very unique kind of fashion, 16 right, then there can -- you know, there is only one 17 explanation that actually can explain the uniqueness of that 18 situation. Right. And the very idea of irreducible 19 complexity trades on that. And so inference to the best 20 explanation is the idea that for any given thing, right, 21 there is always this one ultimate best explanation, right, 22 that you can find from eliminating all the competitors. 23 And -- and -- and the thing about it is, right, inference to 24 the best explanation works if there is a very agreed upon 25 sense of what needs to be explained. And then you say, well,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">169</p> <p>1 demonstrate that natural selection didn't operate, right? 2 A Yes. 3 Q But then what I want to focus on is the second half of that 4 proposition. Therefore, Intelligent Design is the best 5 explanation? 6 A Yes, you're right, it doesn't follow. That's true. 7 Q It doesn't follow? 8 A That's true. It doesn't make it wrong. It just doesn't 9 follow. 10 Q I mean, that's my question. There's no there there, is 11 there? 12 MR. GILLEN: There there, is there? I object to the 13 form. 14 THE WITNESS: No. You have to assume that you've 15 eliminated all the rival hypotheses. Not just one. That's 16 correct. 17 BY MR. ROTHSCILD, CONTINUING: 18 Q And -- and -- and even if -- I think I would agree with that 19 proposition. But then I'm still troubled by how you 20 wouldn't -- on what basis are you making an affirmative case 21 for design by an intelligent designer, or creation by 22 intelligent designer? 23 A I'm doing it on a different basis, right? Namely, I'm trying 24 to expand the possible explanations. I'm not arguing it the 25 way Behe's arguing it.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">170</p> <p>1 Q No, no, I understand. But what I'm saying, you -- you -- you</p> <p>2 made a point which I think I agree with, which is, you know,</p> <p>3 Behe's, you know, effectively elim -- saying he's eliminated</p> <p>4 one possibility, but there might be other hypotheses, right?</p> <p>5 A Yes. Demb -- Dembski has a similar problem, actually.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Okay. So both of them have this problem, right?</p> <p>7 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>8 Q Yes?</p> <p>9 A Yes, yes.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. But then I -- even granted your point, which I do, I'm</p> <p>11 still troubled by the idea that even if you could eliminate</p> <p>12 all the, for example, natural hypotheses that have been</p> <p>13 asserted, one could make a positive case for action by an</p> <p>14 intelligent designer. And I'm trying to understand how that</p> <p>15 follows, which I -- I -- I think is the conclusory</p> <p>16 proposition?</p> <p>17 A Yes. I mean, yes. It doesn't follow. You're absolutely</p> <p>18 right. But typically what happens in these kinds of</p> <p>19 arguments, right, is that the Intelligent Design person, as</p> <p>20 the person who's always facing evolutionary challenge, has</p> <p>21 make the Intelligent Design argument more specified, right?</p> <p>22 So what happens then is that the Intelligent Design argument</p> <p>23 becomes more precise. So I think what -- I don't see it as</p> <p>24 an inherent problem. It just means that there's -- there's</p> <p>25 never going to be a decisive moment where the Intelligent</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">172</p> <p>1 by denying what -- I mean, if you got -- if you got random</p> <p>2 mutation and natural selection as one hypotheses, right, then</p> <p>3 the other -- you know, the other hypothesis could be one</p> <p>4 where there is some kind of plan. And since the cell had --</p> <p>5 you know, the cell is designed the way it is so that it could</p> <p>6 survive many different kinds of changes in the natural</p> <p>7 selection environment. That's not -- that's not an</p> <p>8 incomprehensible notion, right? I mean, it's just to make</p> <p>9 that specific so you could actually test whether it's, you</p> <p>10 know, it's -- it's true in a certain situation, I think</p> <p>11 that's the problem. It's not really specified enough. But,</p> <p>12 you know, I mean -- let me make a follow up point to this.</p> <p>13 Evolutionists and Intelligent Design people can go about</p> <p>14 criticizing each other and that's perfectly fine and that's</p> <p>15 very appropriate in science. But there is also -- you know,</p> <p>16 but as it were, the -- the -- the relative scientific status</p> <p>17 of the theories aren't just determined by those clashes and</p> <p>18 what happens in those clashes. But it's also determined by,</p> <p>19 as it were, how they take it home to develop their own</p> <p>20 theories independently. So if we take seriously the idea</p> <p>21 that Intelligent Design theory is in a way trying to scope</p> <p>22 out the phenomena of reality somewhat differently than the</p> <p>23 evolutionists are, so it includes cosmological issues and</p> <p>24 maybe supernatural issues, even, in a way in which evolution</p> <p>25 rules out of court, right, then what you're also looking at</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">171</p> <p>1 Design argument wins by default by seeing off evolutionary</p> <p>2 challenges. That's all it means.</p> <p>3 Q But I --</p> <p>4 A It doesn't mean it ever -- at no point does it ever get shown</p> <p>5 to be wrong. It -- what -- it shows it hasn't eliminated</p> <p>6 alternatives.</p> <p>7 Q And never would?</p> <p>8 A That's entirely --</p> <p>9 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I mean, that's entirely possible. And</p> <p>11 that's why some people object to the idea of inference to the</p> <p>12 best explanation as being a method in science, wherein a</p> <p>13 sense, right, the question is always open as long as there</p> <p>14 are alternative hypotheses available. People who believe in</p> <p>15 the inference to the best explanation do believe that all the</p> <p>16 opponents are eventually seen off.</p> <p>17 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>18 Q All right. And -- and -- and -- what -- and I -- but I --</p> <p>19 and I'm still trying to get to the point, we're talking about</p> <p>20 inference to the best explanation. But I don't see how</p> <p>21 Intelligent Design is an explanation at -- what the -- what</p> <p>22 the affirmative case is for Intelligent Design even being one</p> <p>23 of the alternatives?</p> <p>24 A Well, I'm not sure. I mean, it seems to me that the</p> <p>25 possibility of space for Intelligent Design is opened up just</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">173</p> <p>1 is not how -- not only how these two theories relate to each</p> <p>2 other, but also how they develop in light of the criticism in</p> <p>3 their own terms. Do they go to the places they're trying to</p> <p>4 go to with regard to explanation and so forth? And so when</p> <p>5 somebody like Meyer, let's say, wants to have this kind of</p> <p>6 covering information theory as the metatheory of Intelligent</p> <p>7 Design, well, that's nothing -- you know, that's -- you know,</p> <p>8 evolutionists think that's just weird, right? But then he's</p> <p>9 trying to do something different. He's not trying to do what</p> <p>10 the evolutionists are doing. So while they do conflict over</p> <p>11 certain areas like how do you explain the cell's stability,</p> <p>12 the overall goals of the research program are somewhat</p> <p>13 different, and so there are different kinds of concerns that</p> <p>14 they will then want to take forward when they develop their</p> <p>15 theories.</p> <p>16 Q Go to the next page of the article, page 540. You invoke the</p> <p>17 well-known and highly regarded Fuller's Fairness Rule, which</p> <p>18 is if you appeal to metaphysical explanations at all, you</p> <p>19 must permit a plurality of them. And you also -- you go on</p> <p>20 to say virtually any metaphysical hypothesis can be</p> <p>21 maintained in the face of any negative evidence. Explain</p> <p>22 what's going on here.</p> <p>23 A Okay. Well, this is, in a sense, kind of the -- it's in --</p> <p>24 it's in a way trying to find a useful place for metaphysics</p> <p>25 and science. Okay. And the idea here being that when</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">174</p> <p>1 metaphysics remains at the level of metaphysics, it becomes a 2 kind of totalizing world view that people will hold no matter 3 what the world is like, because they identify with the world 4 view so much, right? The way things become science is by in 5 some way translating that metaphysical world view into some 6 kind of testable methodology that enables you to separate the 7 people from the ideas, and get rid of the ideas when they're 8 no good, and keep the people around. Now, the way to avoid 9 the kind of totalizing tendency in metaphysics is to just 10 allow lots of different metaphysical views free play, and 11 then try to figure out some way of putting them in -- in -- 12 in sort of some testable relationship with each other. So 13 what you don't want is one metaphysical view dominating. And 14 that includes science itself. So in a sense, you can take 15 this as an argument against having a unified principle of 16 naturalism, for example, in science, as well as 17 supernaturalism, understood as totalizing views. You could 18 have both, but you don't just want one or the other, okay, 19 because then there's no way you can falsify it. And I think 20 this raises the question, right, with natural -- I mean, I 21 think that's a fair point to ask. Supposing I'm a 22 naturalist, I have these naturalistic commitments to science, 23 how would I falsify that? Is there some circumstance, if I'm 24 one of these hard core methodological naturalists that 25 Penneck is always talking about, you know, under what</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">176</p> <p>1 that we've got. But the problem is when you -- when you use 2 it, you know, if it ain't broke don't fix it argument, right, 3 which is what it boils down to is where is the incentive 4 within science to challenge methodological naturalism? In 5 other words, where is there incentive within science as it's 6 constituted today to actually try to scientifically test 7 naturalism? And you see you just don't find it. And that's 8 where these guys -- these Intelligent Design people come in. 9 Because if nothing else, they're doing that, you see. But 10 otherwise, it's dogmatic. If there is no -- If there is no 11 incentive within the scientific community itself to challenge 12 its most fundamental assumptions, then that view is outside 13 of the domain of science and becomes metaphysics. And that's 14 what's happened to naturalism within science today. You 15 know, and -- and -- and -- and Intelligent Design in that 16 respect can serve as an interesting corrective to this 17 dogmatism regardless of whether it accomplishes its own 18 positive program. And at the end of the day, of course, you 19 don't know whether it's going to do that. But it will be 20 interesting as a corrective to this kind of dogmatism. 21 Q You suspect that eventually the Intelligent Design will 22 revert from this concept which involves supernatural 23 explanations to something that leads to naturalism? 24 MR. GILLEN: Objection to form. 25 THE WITNESS: I mean, I think what will happen is that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">175</p> <p>1 circumstance as a scientist would I be willing to give up 2 that belief? Are there any conditions? My guess is no 3 because it's going to be defined in the nature of science 4 that you have to be a methodological naturalist. Now, for 5 me, that's just metaphysics if that -- if you end up with 6 that kind of perspective on things. And so, I mean, this -- 7 this is why I think methodological -- so-called 8 methodological naturalism really is ultimately metaphysical 9 naturalism. 10 Q Well, Penneck makes the case that, you know, methodological 11 naturalism is not dogmatic, it's just what scientists do 12 because it works, and that scientists haven't figured out how 13 to expand science beyond that to include -- 14 A But so do -- 15 Q -- supernatural? 16 A But some people do try to test for these things, especially 17 with paranormal phenomena. So there -- so as it were, there 18 are active scientific research programs that are actually 19 trying to stretch the boundaries of science beyond the 20 so-called natural. And in any case, and -- okay. And those 21 people are often regarded as fringe researchers in science. 22 But really now, when we say -- when we talk about things 23 working, and I'm not doubting that methodological naturalism 24 has worked for science and that it's largely responsible for 25 lots of science that we've got, maybe even most of science</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">177</p> <p>1 this dispute will lose its salience after a while. Okay. I 2 think that's true. I mean, and -- and so yes, in that 3 respect, I don't -- I -- I mean, I actually -- I imagine a 4 kind of renormalization of Intelligent Design within the 5 scientific community. But I think in a context where the 6 distinction between supernaturalism and naturalism isn't 7 really animating people's imagination anymore. 8 BY MR. ROTHCHILD, CONTINUING: 9 Q Because it's been discarded? 10 A Yeah, I think so. I think so because, see, naturalism 11 historically has relied on a very robust sense of what 12 empirical material reality is. Right. So the idea that, you 13 know, the primary form of physical motion is this being in 14 contact with this, right, and this is like empirically 15 accessible, and it's, you know, physically constituted and all 16 the rest of it. But increasing amounts of science these days 17 are incredibly mediated. That is to say, they're not really 18 in direct contact with the empirical physical phenomena we're 19 supposedly trying to explain. I mean, even the evolutionists 20 are, you know, speculating about, you know, what life forms 21 were like millions of years ago and so forth, we're doing 22 computer simulations all the time. And so from that 23 standpoint, if you end up doing most of your science on 24 computer simulation, and that the direct object of inquiry, 25 the direct, not the ultimate, but the direct object of</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">178</p> <p>1 inquiry is a virtualization of something, then I don't think</p> <p>2 naturalism has much pull there. Right. See, naturalism</p> <p>3 is -- is -- is a kind of -- is a -- is a -- is a sort of a</p> <p>4 remnant of a period when people were actually roaming around</p> <p>5 the earth looking at things, you know, and doing physical</p> <p>6 experiments and holding stuff and all that. But more and</p> <p>7 more of science is being mediated. And so that nature is</p> <p>8 receding. And so as that happens, I think this distinction</p> <p>9 between naturalism and supernaturalism will kind of</p> <p>10 disappear, won't be salient anymore, won't cause these kinds</p> <p>11 of disturbances.</p> <p>12 Q Let's go to the last paragraph of your article. You use a</p> <p>13 metaphor here that -- of scientific knowledge currently is</p> <p>14 akin to tributaries issuing into a major river. And you</p> <p>15 suggest I want to reverse that because you presume that such</p> <p>16 such discoveries are already biased, and you support the</p> <p>17 development of ID theory as part of a general strategy of</p> <p>18 converting the image of knowledge to tributaries --</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q From that of tributaries to that of a delta.</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Unpack that for me.</p> <p>23 A Okay. Well, the idea here is that -- I mean, if you look at</p> <p>24 somebody like William Whewell, who I mentioned here in the</p> <p>25 paragraph, he -- he -- he kind of has this -- he starts off</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">180</p> <p>1 you try to take things in a different direction, that you're</p> <p>2 somehow outside of science automatically. And that's the</p> <p>3 thing I'm objecting to.</p> <p>4 Q So you want to sort of -- am I correct in understanding</p> <p>5 you're suggesting that we would benefit from sort of</p> <p>6 reversing the flow of knowledge?</p> <p>7 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Well, I think what -- what one would want</p> <p>9 to do is to -- it's not so much reversing the flow of</p> <p>10 knowledge, but rather not presuming that the fact that</p> <p>11 knowledge has consolidated in a paradigm is necessarily a</p> <p>12 good thing for the future of science, and that rather,</p> <p>13 whenever knowledge consolidates, we want to encourage it to</p> <p>14 be used and developed in many different directions so as to</p> <p>15 get many different competing theories, because it's just all</p> <p>16 too easy, given the way in which science can be</p> <p>17 institutionalized through people being all trained in the</p> <p>18 same way to think the same way about things, and also given</p> <p>19 the amount of authority science still has in society for a</p> <p>20 dogma to solidify. And the thing is, we need to take</p> <p>21 measures to sort of prevent that. And that's why encouraging</p> <p>22 alternative viewpoints that take a lot of the same body of</p> <p>23 knowledge but taken in different directions is very salutary.</p> <p>24 And again, this is where Intelligent Design comes in as far</p> <p>25 as I'm concerned, as a kind of a -- as a kind of way of sort</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">179</p> <p>1 with this tributary idea. And what he imagines, and so he's</p> <p>2 imagining basically how you got to Newton. If Newton is kind</p> <p>3 of like the one big river, right, the tributaries that are</p> <p>4 flowing into it are like Galileo, Copernicus, Kepler, all</p> <p>5 these guys, right, from the previous 50, 100 years. And then</p> <p>6 they consolidate into this one mainstream science, right,</p> <p>7 which then becomes the foundation, you know, for all of</p> <p>8 scientific work after that. That was his image, right. And</p> <p>9 he thought that in fact in the 19th Century, we'd gotten to</p> <p>10 that point with Newton. All right. Now, what I'm saying is</p> <p>11 I'm looking at it the other way around. Namely, that we --</p> <p>12 yes. We have this kind of dominant mainstream science that</p> <p>13 is the result of all of these different things coming in, but</p> <p>14 we want to diversify the directions in which the science goes</p> <p>15 in the future. So to apply to the current issue at hand, my</p> <p>16 idea would be, yes, teach all of these kids all the details</p> <p>17 of evolutionary theory, all the evidence, all the claims</p> <p>18 being made, but encourage them to move it into different</p> <p>19 research programs, different theoretical directions, some of</p> <p>20 which contest the traditional assumptions under which that</p> <p>21 evidence had been gathered. So it becomes more like a delta</p> <p>22 in the sense you have many different research programs coming</p> <p>23 from a common body of knowledge, because at the moment, the</p> <p>24 tendency is that if you're going to do science, you have to</p> <p>25 learn it in some kind of dominant, paradigm way, and that if</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">181</p> <p>1 of, you know, opening up the different futures that are</p> <p>2 available to science, using a lot of the stuff that</p> <p>3 evolutionists have been largely responsible for cultivating</p> <p>4 as evidence and so forth.</p> <p>5 BY MR. ROTHSCILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>6 Q Effectively like a wedge to break into the current dogma?</p> <p>7 A This wedge notion, very sinister stuff. I -- I bet -- I</p> <p>8 think it's -- it's a problem that just not biology has, but I</p> <p>9 think all sciences have this problem of solidifying. And</p> <p>10 what you want to do is you really -- and it's also a way of</p> <p>11 making science meaningful to a broad range of people who come</p> <p>12 to science with many different kinds of interests, because I</p> <p>13 think especially people who don't know much about the history</p> <p>14 of science, there's a tendency to think that you have to</p> <p>15 think like a scientist in order to do good science. And</p> <p>16 thinking like a scientist is a certain kind of mindset that</p> <p>17 let's say doesn't allow you to have politics, doesn't allow</p> <p>18 you to have religion, doesn't allow you to have metaphysics.</p> <p>19 You have to leave all that stuff on the door, where in fact,</p> <p>20 those have often been very strongly motivating factors. All</p> <p>21 right. And in a sense, you want to encourage people to use</p> <p>22 those different motivations they have for doing science, but</p> <p>23 then be willing to publicly have their theories tested in the</p> <p>24 appropriate forums. That's when the scientific moment</p> <p>25 happens. Okay. And then once that happens, then the people</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">182</p> <p>1 can take it in as many different directions as they want.</p> <p>2 Q Is it fair to say that you don't have any particular</p> <p>3 attraction to Intelligent Design, but it's representative of</p> <p>4 a challenge to sort of current scientific behavior?</p> <p>5 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Let's put it this way. I think it's true</p> <p>7 that I am more interested in Intelligent Design in terms of</p> <p>8 its function in the current scientific scene as a kind of,</p> <p>9 you know, loyal opposition, as it were, offering an</p> <p>10 alternative future for science and so forth than I am</p> <p>11 committed to any of the specific doctrines.</p> <p>12 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Let me take a break.</p> <p>13 MR. GILLEN: Sure.</p> <p>14 (A brief recess taken at 2:30 p.m.)</p> <p>15 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Ready, Bob?</p> <p>16 COURT REPORTER: All set.</p> <p>17 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>18 Q Could you turn your report to page ten. In the first</p> <p>19 paragraph you had a sentence, ID proponents argue primarily</p> <p>20 by appeal to empirical evidence gathered in the laboratory</p> <p>21 and the field, employing methods of reasoning, both</p> <p>22 qualitative and quantitative familiar from the other branches</p> <p>23 of science. Let's start with the empirical evidence gathered</p> <p>24 in the laboratory and the field. What are you referring to</p> <p>25 there?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">184</p> <p>1 things like that. That's one of the reasons why philosophers</p> <p>2 get very interested in what these guys do, is because they're</p> <p>3 in fact using these modes of reasoning that they can see how,</p> <p>4 you know, in other branches of science they're used. But</p> <p>5 they're going to challenge them in this particular context.</p> <p>6 Q And then later in the paragraph you say that ID proponents</p> <p>7 believe precisely that specific supernatural explanations are</p> <p>8 testable. What are you referring to?</p> <p>9 A Well, I mean here the -- that the idea of coming up with</p> <p>10 specific constraints on -- on the param -- specific</p> <p>11 constraints under which design can happen, so something like</p> <p>12 Dembski's explanatory filter, right, properly specified</p> <p>13 would -- would not just be any -- providing any old</p> <p>14 supernatural explanation, but one that, as it were, has</p> <p>15 certain kinds of parameters within which certain phenomenon</p> <p>16 could be explained.</p> <p>17 Q And your understanding is today that it's not -- it's not</p> <p>18 sufficiently specific?</p> <p>19 A It hasn't gotten to that level yet, no. But that does seem</p> <p>20 to be an aspiration.</p> <p>21 Q And other than Dembski, do you have other examples where ID</p> <p>22 proponents believe that specific supernatural explanations</p> <p>23 are testable?</p> <p>24 A Well, they believe it. Whether or not -- they haven't</p> <p>25 produced any that -- that meet these criteria. But I think</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">183</p> <p>1 A Well, I'm actually referring to when ID proponents are</p> <p>2 dealing with evidence that people who've been doing</p> <p>3 evolutionary biology produced. So I'm not saying that they</p> <p>4 produce it themselves, but rather they are appealing to it</p> <p>5 and making reference to it.</p> <p>6 Q So is it fair to say that so far as you know, Intelligent</p> <p>7 Design proponents have not been generating data from the</p> <p>8 laboratory in the field themselves?</p> <p>9 A Well, actually, Behe, I think, has done laboratory work. I</p> <p>10 mean, I think he has. Of course, Dembski is a mathematician,</p> <p>11 and so he does what mathematicians do.</p> <p>12 Q And when you talk about Behe doing laboratory work, I mean,</p> <p>13 are you referring to work that supports his Intelligent</p> <p>14 Design theory or other work?</p> <p>15 A Well, I believe that he does do laboratory work that does</p> <p>16 support his -- his views, but most of his work is in fact the</p> <p>17 reinterpretation of laboratory evidence when it gets right</p> <p>18 down to it.</p> <p>19 Q And then you say that they employ methods of reasoning</p> <p>20 familiar from the other branches of science. What are you</p> <p>21 referring to there?</p> <p>22 A Well, so, for example, you know, the use of probability</p> <p>23 theory on the part of Dembski. These -- also the modes of</p> <p>24 explanation that we were in fact talking about earlier, the</p> <p>25 sort of inference to the best explanation, other kinds of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">185</p> <p>1 that is the -- that is the aim. I mean, I think at this</p> <p>2 point, they're fighting a sort of a more general battle about</p> <p>3 allowing such explanations bearing in the first place.</p> <p>4 Q Do you think that the absence of a naturalistic explanation</p> <p>5 is a test of a supernatural explanation for an aspect of</p> <p>6 biology?</p> <p>7 A Not a proper test, but it certainly opens up the line of</p> <p>8 inquiry to pursue such things.</p> <p>9 Q Why isn't it a proper test?</p> <p>10 A Well, basically, it leaves open the question about what the</p> <p>11 explan -- because there's -- it could be that perhaps --</p> <p>12 perhaps one hasn't come up with an adequate, you know,</p> <p>13 naturalistic hypothesis. Right. One, you know, as it were,</p> <p>14 scientists run out of imagination. But within the</p> <p>15 naturalistic sphere, they could perhaps come up with</p> <p>16 something. But the point is if there is an absence of a</p> <p>17 naturalistic explanation, that certainly opens -- that.....</p> <p>18 certainly provides an -- an interesting opening for people</p> <p>19 who want to think in anti or supernaturalistic terms. I</p> <p>20 mean, certainly from a heuristic standpoint, that would be,</p> <p>21 if you wanted to pursue supernatural explanations, that would</p> <p>22 be the place to go.</p> <p>23 Q If you could turn to page 13, bottom of the last full</p> <p>24 paragraph, you talk about Miller taking advantage of the</p> <p>25 tendency of ID proponents to overplay their hand -- overplay</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">186</p> <p>1 their hand rhetorically. What do you mean by that?</p> <p>2 A This is -- yeah. I know -- I recall saying this. I just</p> <p>3 can't quite find where you're looking at.</p> <p>4 Q It's the second full paragraph.</p> <p>5 A Second full paragraph, okay.</p> <p>6 Q Towards the bottom of the page.</p> <p>7 A Right. I mean, the point here being that -- that if ID is</p> <p>8 able to provide a scientific explanation for something, that</p> <p>9 doesn't rule out the evolutionary one. But there's a</p> <p>10 tendency to sort of see those things, I think on both sides,</p> <p>11 in mutually exclusive terms. So if we can provide an</p> <p>12 explanation and you guys -- and you guys can't then, you</p> <p>13 know, in principle, we're the only ones who can. So, I mean,</p> <p>14 I do think that there's a tendency on both sides to think</p> <p>15 that the two are sort of mutually exclusive.</p> <p>16 Q And you say then epistemological legitimacy of ID doesn't</p> <p>17 require showing that evolution cannot provide a credible --</p> <p>18 A Right, right.</p> <p>19 Q -- alternative framework, just requires showing that ID has</p> <p>20 an explanatory framework that can be the basis for a body of</p> <p>21 scientific research?</p> <p>22 A That's right. I was making that point earlier with regard to</p> <p>23 the fact that you just can't judge the legitimacy of ID just</p> <p>24 purely in terms of how it faces up against evolution. You</p> <p>25 have to see how it is able to develop the stuff in terms of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">188</p> <p>1 A No, no, it has -- no, it isn't that. I mean, it's to say</p> <p>2 that the cell has to have certain kind of components in place</p> <p>3 in order to have the stability it has so that it's able to</p> <p>4 survive all the various changes in the environment. Now, it</p> <p>5 seems to me that that project, if it were fully executed,</p> <p>6 could be done independently of anything going on in</p> <p>7 evolutionary theory. I mean -- I mean, so in that respect,</p> <p>8 Intelligent Design could be pursued as an independent</p> <p>9 program.</p> <p>10 Q So if -- if Behe simply showed empirical evidence of the cell</p> <p>11 maintaining stability --</p> <p>12 A Well, this is what I would say. I mean, I wouldn't do it</p> <p>13 that way. I would actually go to the computer simulation and</p> <p>14 try to model the cell, right, and actually try to come up</p> <p>15 with the parameters whose interactions end up producing a</p> <p>16 cell, right, a virtual cell, simulation of a cell, right,</p> <p>17 that is able then to maintain its stability in the face of</p> <p>18 the kinds of environmental changes that we normally think of</p> <p>19 cells as being able to survive in. Right. So if you were</p> <p>20 able to do that, and so he could then say, look, I've been</p> <p>21 able to program a cell, and you can do it this way, and</p> <p>22 there's not going to be an alternative evolutionary</p> <p>23 explanation for that. And as it were, then throw the</p> <p>24 gauntlet down and say, you come up with something that isn't</p> <p>25 as designed as this, that in some sense has a kind of random</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">187</p> <p>1 its own framework.</p> <p>2 Q And what is your understanding of the explanatory framework</p> <p>3 ID offers other than the assertion that evolution doesn't</p> <p>4 provide a credible framework?</p> <p>5 A Well, I mean, this is where the explanatory filter and the</p> <p>6 irreducibly complexity notions get mobilized as a way of</p> <p>7 suggesting research avenues. I mean, that's -- that's the</p> <p>8 basic -- that's what I mean by the explanatory framework,</p> <p>9 that within which then research can be done.</p> <p>10 Q But isn't irreducible complexity nothing more than the</p> <p>11 assertion that the evolutionary framework doesn't work?</p> <p>12 A No, it isn't more than that, I mean, because the issue then</p> <p>13 depends -- determines -- it turns on how you actually develop</p> <p>14 this thesis, right. And presumably, what you want to do with</p> <p>15 the irreducible complexity is to identify as it were the</p> <p>16 parameters that -- all of which have to be in place in order</p> <p>17 to sell -- in order for the cell to have its stability the</p> <p>18 way it does, and that there's no way of removing any of those</p> <p>19 parameters without in fact undermining the stability of the</p> <p>20 cell, and that evolution cannot provide an alternative to</p> <p>21 that. So it seems that there is a self-contained research</p> <p>22 program that perhaps has not been fully executed but is</p> <p>23 suggested by the idea.</p> <p>24 Q And I'm not sure what that is besides the fact that evolution</p> <p>25 or natural selection isn't an adequate explanation?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">189</p> <p>1 element or something, and you still get this kind of</p> <p>2 stability over time. I don't think he's done that yet, but</p> <p>3 it seems to me it could be done. I mean, it'd probably be</p> <p>4 very difficult, but not out of the question. I mean, I'll</p> <p>5 tell you one advan -- one -- one thing about Intelligent</p> <p>6 Design that I think is worth pointing out is because you</p> <p>7 don't actually have departments and schools and disciplines</p> <p>8 of Intelligent Design, there's not a ready-made way of</p> <p>9 training people in the kinds of skills that'll be necessary</p> <p>10 to sort of carry out a lot of the details of this project. I</p> <p>11 mean, that's a real problem, I think, that they face</p> <p>12 sociologically at the moment because, you know, if you've</p> <p>13 only got a few guys kind of putting forward bold hypotheses</p> <p>14 and trying to do very sort of striking bits of forays, you</p> <p>15 know, challenging evolutionists, you can only go so far. You</p> <p>16 really need to train generations of people. In fact, that --</p> <p>17 you know, that's how any science survives. And it was only</p> <p>18 starting in the 1930's and '40's that you start to be able to</p> <p>19 train biologists who have a sufficient range of skills to</p> <p>20 actually be able to contribute to Neo-Darwinism as this</p> <p>21 fully-fledged program that we see it today. So, you know,</p> <p>22 a way, they do have a sort of sociological disadvantage here.</p> <p>23 They're basically trying to cover a lot of the waterfront all</p> <p>24 by themselves, and of course they don't have all the skills</p> <p>25 to do it. This is why they would need a school of people to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">190</p> <p>1 sort of carry this out.</p> <p>2 Q Do you have any conjecture about why there isn't a school of</p> <p>3 people though?</p> <p>4 A Well, I think one of the problems is the stuff doesn't get</p> <p>5 taught. I mean, this is where bringing it into the high</p> <p>6 schools would be a good idea in terms of recruiting the next</p> <p>7 generation of people, you know, as a kind of alternative to,</p> <p>8 you know, Neo-Darwinism, as a way of taking forward the kind</p> <p>9 of phenomena that's been identified in evolutionary biology.</p> <p>10 And presumably, that would be one of the reasons to in fact</p> <p>11 want to teach this in the schools, would be to create a fair</p> <p>12 fight as it were, to be able to seed a generation of students</p> <p>13 who might be motivated to try to carry this work forward</p> <p>14 because I think being realistic, there's only so much you can</p> <p>15 expect of Behe or Dembski to do themselves.</p> <p>16 Q But if this was a proposition which had some legs, so to</p> <p>17 speak, that was, you know, that had the capacity to lead to a</p> <p>18 positive research program, you know, where is it in the</p> <p>19 universities, the Ph.D. programs?</p> <p>20 A Well, you know, it seems to me that it may be a little too</p> <p>21 early, actually. And I wouldn't be surprised if there are</p> <p>22 some Christian universities or Islamic universities that are</p> <p>23 perhaps pursuing this kind of stuff now. I mean, again, I'm</p> <p>24 not familiar with it. But I'd be very surprised if there</p> <p>25 aren't programs trying to be established in this area. But</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">192</p> <p>1 A That means people who hold this view have different sorts of</p> <p>2 religious beliefs.</p> <p>3 Q And what's your basis for that?</p> <p>4 A Well, I believe some of these people are Protestants, some</p> <p>5 are Catholics. You know, so in terms of their theology,</p> <p>6 they're not necessarily compatible with each other. Some are</p> <p>7 quite fundamentalist, others are much more liberal in their</p> <p>8 theological orientations. Yes, I mean, that's just my -- my</p> <p>9 view. My basis for that view, because sometimes it is said</p> <p>10 Intelligent Design somehow wants to impose a theological</p> <p>11 orthodoxy on the school system, and you would have thought if</p> <p>12 that were the case, then these people would be theologically</p> <p>13 much more similar to each other.</p> <p>14 Q Are you familiar with The Wedge document?</p> <p>15 A I saw it referred to by -- is it Forrest?</p> <p>16 Q Right.</p> <p>17 (Marked for identification Fuller Deposition Exhibit</p> <p>18 No. 6)</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I have not read it myself. Okay, okay.</p> <p>20 Looks interesting.</p> <p>21 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>22 Q If you want to take a few minutes to go through it --</p> <p>23 A You want to direct my attention to something?</p> <p>24 Q I will. I think the whole thing is --</p> <p>25 A Sort of savor it in its full glory, is that it? Who wrote</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">191</p> <p>1 it seems to me, again, we have to look at the time scale. I</p> <p>2 mean, it took quite a while for Darwinism to get the kind of</p> <p>3 legs that we're talking about here, all right. And, you</p> <p>4 know, people like Charles Darwin himself were located outside</p> <p>5 the academy and, you know, the guys who were supportive of</p> <p>6 Darwin early on and for a while were themselves people who</p> <p>7 were specialists in certain kinds of areas but didn't have</p> <p>8 the full range of skills really to carry forward the whole</p> <p>9 thing in the -- in the -- as a big research program. I mean,</p> <p>10 it's only when you get to the 1930's and '40's, 80 years</p> <p>11 later that you actually start to get, you know, a group of</p> <p>12 people from coming from different directions who actually</p> <p>13 have a sufficiently broad range of skills to put it all</p> <p>14 together in some fashion. And it seems to me Intelligent</p> <p>15 Design is far away from that at this point. But then, you</p> <p>16 know, I wouldn't have discouraged Darwinism either when it</p> <p>17 was in its infancy and was struggling, you know. So I just</p> <p>18 think there's a sense in which this is one reason why it</p> <p>19 should be taught in the high schools as a way of trying to</p> <p>20 seed that additional generation so that you can start giving</p> <p>21 this thing some legs and start to see just how far it can go.</p> <p>22 Q You say in your report that Intelligent Design is religiously</p> <p>23 heterodox?</p> <p>24 A Yeah.</p> <p>25 Q What do you mean by that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">193</p> <p>1 this?</p> <p>2 MR. GILLEN: That will be the subject of much</p> <p>3 discussion, no doubt, off the record.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Oh, I see. So someone knows?</p> <p>5 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>6 Q I know somebody who I was going to ask, but I missed the</p> <p>7 opportunity.</p> <p>8 A Yes, yes. Okay.</p> <p>9 Q You've had a chance to skim through the document?</p> <p>10 A Yes, yes, I have.</p> <p>11 Q And you have some sense of the flavor of the document?</p> <p>12 A Yes, I -- yes.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. I want to focus your attention on what's got the</p> <p>14 handwriting page four on the document, I'm not sure if it's</p> <p>15 the actual fourth page in order. But it says five year</p> <p>16 strategic plan summary.</p> <p>17 A Oh, yes.</p> <p>18 Q You see there that there's discussion about Phillip Johnson's</p> <p>19 books and Michael Behe's book Darwin's Black Box?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And it then talks about the theory of Intelligent Design?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And then it goes on to say design theory promises to</p> <p>24 reverse the stifling dominance of the materialist world view</p> <p>25 and to replace it with a science consonant with Christian an</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">194</p> <p>1 theistic convictions. As an articulation of -- and let me</p> <p>2 reference, as you can see from the document, it indicates</p> <p>3 it's from the Discovery Institute?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And you've previously indicated the Discovery Institute is the</p> <p>6 think tank that's identified with Intelligent Design?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Assuming that this is in fact a -- you know, document</p> <p>9 representing the views of the Discovery Institute, what is</p> <p>10 your reaction to it as a representation of the concept of</p> <p>11 Intelligent Design?</p> <p>12 A Well, it strikes me that here where there's this attempt to</p> <p>13 take Intelligent Design in making it into a major cultural</p> <p>14 force in American society, right? Specifically one that will</p> <p>15 overturn materialism which I guess is sort of a secular -- of</p> <p>16 secular world view. I questions that's the thrust of this</p> <p>17 document.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. And if that's in fact the objective, is that -- do you</p> <p>19 consider that problematic?</p> <p>20 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, it's certainly problematic</p> <p>22 if it's being taught as science in public schools. But</p> <p>23 presumably this document is somewhat targeted differently.</p> <p>24 So, I mean, I guess I would need more context to -- you know,</p> <p>25 in terms of in what sense problematic are you asking?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">196</p> <p>1 mean -- I mean, because by that standards, you know, if</p> <p>2 you -- if -- you know, Nazi Germany was very big on Mendelian</p> <p>3 genetics. Okay. Racial hygiene program was based on that</p> <p>4 kind of thing. Right. Lots of documents were produced that</p> <p>5 actually made reference to Mendelian genetics as being, you</p> <p>6 know, sort of the backbone of a sort of racial hygiene</p> <p>7 strategy for the country. That, you know, Mendelian genetics</p> <p>8 is still around.</p> <p>9 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>10 Q Would you consider it problematic if Mendel has developed his</p> <p>11 theory in order to justify eugenics?</p> <p>12 A I think it would be a problem -- well, the thing is, of</p> <p>13 course, there are some real geneticists who did do something</p> <p>14 like that. So we don't even have to look at Mendel. We've</p> <p>15 got some real guys. And it seems to me that there you still</p> <p>16 want to set -- I mean, you want to distinguish the context of</p> <p>17 discovery from the context of justification. And we may</p> <p>18 regard these geneticists as very problematic people, and we</p> <p>19 might dislike their politics and so forth, but at the end of</p> <p>20 the day, we have to see whether the science stands up,</p> <p>21 whether the claims stand up scientifically. And that's where</p> <p>22 it becomes important to have a sort of clear sense of, you</p> <p>23 know, criteria of testability. So in a sense, we can cordon</p> <p>24 off whatever unfavorable or unsavory associations these</p> <p>25 theories might have. And also to large -- to enable more</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">195</p> <p>1 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>2 Q All right. Let me be clear. I'm not suggesting to you that</p> <p>3 this document is being presented to the public school</p> <p>4 students.</p> <p>5 A Right.</p> <p>6 Q And what I am suggesting is it's a characterization of the</p> <p>7 Discovery Institute's view on the significance of Intelligent</p> <p>8 Design theory. And would you agree with that?</p> <p>9 A Yes, I understand. Okay.</p> <p>10 Q And would you agree it reads that way?</p> <p>11 A Yes, it certainly gives the cultural context in which</p> <p>12 Intelligent Design makes sense.</p> <p>13 Q And if this is the objective of the people who are developing</p> <p>14 Intelligent Design, do you consider that problematic?</p> <p>15 MR. GILLEN: Object to form.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Well, again, it depends the context in</p> <p>17 which we're talking about Intelligent Design. Again, people</p> <p>18 can have all kinds of motivations, they may be thinking</p> <p>19 they're staging a cultural revolution. But what matters is</p> <p>20 exactly how their theories are tested. Okay. And even if</p> <p>21 it's true, that the authors that we've been talking about</p> <p>22 here in this deposition subscribe to this plan. The fact</p> <p>23 that they are submitting their stuff to this kind of scrutiny</p> <p>24 and criticism doesn't take away from that -- from the</p> <p>25 scientific character of the work in that forum, okay. I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">197</p> <p>1 people to kind of deal with these theories, right? I mean,</p> <p>2 you know -- you know, one reason why you don't want the</p> <p>3 you don't want the Nazis to have a monopoly on Mendelian</p> <p>4 genetics isn't just because of all the atrocities they'll</p> <p>5 then be able to conduct. But also because it would restrict</p> <p>6 the -- the availability of Mendelian genetics to just those</p> <p>7 people and not allow it to have sort of more general purchase</p> <p>8 where it could actually be of use, you know, and maybe of</p> <p>9 some significance both scientifically and practically in the</p> <p>10 rest of society. And I would have a similar sort of line to</p> <p>11 say about Intelligent Design, that it would be a mistake to</p> <p>12 associate it too much with this particular movement, even if</p> <p>13 the people who are doing the Intelligent Design theory are</p> <p>14 associated with it.</p> <p>15 Q So if I understand you correctly, and I'm sure you're right</p> <p>16 that there were geneticists who did their research to -- in</p> <p>17 service of the eugenics of the Nazis?</p> <p>18 A That's right.</p> <p>19 Q And I think what you're saying is as horrible as that is,</p> <p>20 that some of it may have actually advanced the science of</p> <p>21 genetics in a positive way that otherwise stands up as usable</p> <p>22 and constitutes good science?</p> <p>23 A That's right. That's right.</p> <p>24 Q And --</p> <p>25 A Not necessarily though through the work they did as Nazis</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">198</p> <p>1 okay?</p> <p>2 Q Oh, I understand. I'm not trying to negatively associate you</p> <p>3 in --</p> <p>4 MR. GILLEN: For the record, he's not a Nazi.</p> <p>5 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>6 Q And what you're saying -- and what I think you're saying is</p> <p>7 that the way we can differentiate the valuable science from</p> <p>8 its maligned motives is through this standard of testability?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And that's -- and that similar standard is -- is what</p> <p>11 should be used to determine whether Intelligent Design has</p> <p>12 scientific merit?</p> <p>13 A Yes. I mean, that's -- that's my general attitude. So in a</p> <p>14 sense, to neutralize the effect of something like this.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Do you understand -- do you take this document to be</p> <p>16 communicating a religiously heterodox view?</p> <p>17 A It's very difficult to say, to be perfectly honest. I mean,</p> <p>18 my view about this document, I think this document is</p> <p>19 misleadingly optimistic in a sense about what it thinks it</p> <p>20 can accomplish because I think that all these various people</p> <p>21 who are being referred to here as part of Intelligent Design</p> <p>22 and contributing to this larger cultural movement in fact</p> <p>23 were they to somehow get into power, become commissars of</p> <p>24 education and research and things like that would in fact</p> <p>25 have many differences amongst themselves. Okay. So what I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">200</p> <p>1 by that?</p> <p>2 A I'm just reading. I know it's a sentence. I'm just reading</p> <p>3 to see what it says. I do think that -- I mean, here what</p> <p>4 I'm saying is that I'm talking about in this paragraph is the</p> <p>5 way in which religious fundamentalism developed as a kind of</p> <p>6 a reaction against science, once with World War I, and all</p> <p>7 the ways in which science was involved in a lot of the sort</p> <p>8 of atrocities of the 20th Century. And that actually helped</p> <p>9 the rise of religious fundamentalism. And in a way, because</p> <p>10 ID does have some roots in the -- in the religion, that --</p> <p>11 that it's been able to sort of cast itself, as one says,</p> <p>12 being scientific, and also kind of in a way sympathetic with</p> <p>13 these larger kinds of concerns. So it sort of straddles that</p> <p>14 rhetorically, it seems to me. I mean, in fact, you know, the</p> <p>15 Wedge document kind of is in a very extreme version of that.</p> <p>16 Q And elsewhere in your report you say that ID's religious</p> <p>17 dimensions are both legally and scientifically benign.</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q What do you mean by religious dimensions?</p> <p>20 A Well, I mean the motivations of the people doing it. Right.</p> <p>21 The extent to which these people who want to come up with</p> <p>22 ideas of Intelligent Design actually believe in a creator or</p> <p>23 something like that. And so they're benign in the sense that</p> <p>24 because the way they have to articulate their claims makes it</p> <p>25 subject to scrutiny by people who don't share those beliefs,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">199</p> <p>1 think is more a common foe than any kind of common positive</p> <p>2 view, some monolithic Christianity or something that they</p> <p>3 would be imposing on the world, but rather they don't like</p> <p>4 secular materialism and they're all against that. It's kind</p> <p>5 of like my enemy's enemy is my friend. So I actually think</p> <p>6 there's -- there's, you know, there's kind of more -- more</p> <p>7 huffing and puffing going on than I think one really needs to</p> <p>8 be worried about. At least that's my own personal -- maybe</p> <p>9 I'm being naive, but that's my own personal view.</p> <p>10 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Off the record.</p> <p>11 (A brief recess taken at 3:33 p.m.)</p> <p>12 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Back on the record?</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: How publicly is available is this</p> <p>14 document?</p> <p>15 MR. ROTHSCHILD: I'll give you the back story off the</p> <p>16 record.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Okay, okay.</p> <p>18 MR. GILLEN: It's quite a story.</p> <p>19 MR. ROTHSCHILD: So much as I know.</p> <p>20 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>21 Q If you turn to page six of your report.</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q You -- this is maybe two-thirds of the way down, the full</p> <p>24 paragraph. You say that ID has an ambiguous position</p> <p>25 concerning matters of science and religion. What do you mean</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">201</p> <p>1 that then it enters into the realm of science, and it's</p> <p>2 religiously benign. Also -- I should say also I'm making</p> <p>3 reference to the fact that because they have these different</p> <p>4 religious views, there -- I don't actually believe there is a</p> <p>5 conspiracy against the public interest here, with all</p> <p>6 these -- contrary to this Wedge document. I actually don't</p> <p>7 believe there is that kind of unity. That in fact there's a</p> <p>8 diversity of religious views represented.</p> <p>9 Q If you could turn to page 16 of your report.</p> <p>10 A Yeah.</p> <p>11 Q You report this NAS statement about the significance of</p> <p>12 evolution to the science of biology, correct?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q And then you, I think it's fair to say, question that</p> <p>15 proposition?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q And call into question whether Darwinian explanation --</p> <p>18 Darwinian evolution actually has as much significance as</p> <p>19 suggested by the NAS?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And you call into question where you -- where you -- where</p> <p>22 you would look to determine whether the statement in fact has</p> <p>23 merit?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Have you studied this question of whether Darwinian evolution</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">202</p> <p>1 actually has, you know, practical utility in the sense 2 suggested by the NAS?</p> <p>3 A Well, it seems to me that there -- that there is, I mean, as 4 I point out later on, right, they sort of hedged the issue by 5 talking about helping to explain. They don't actually claim 6 themselves -- I mean, they kind of hedge the issue. So on 7 the one hand, if you read the statement superficially, 8 they're claiming that evolution is, you know, essential for 9 all these different fields and all these different things. 10 But then if you read closely, they say it helps to explain. 11 So in other words, they don't actually -- they themselves 12 don't want to quite commit themselves to the idea that all 13 these people from these different sciences are actually using 14 evolution themselves, okay?</p> <p>15 Q Well, I mean, let me observe, I think that is a pretty 16 superficial reading because would you expect them to say if 17 evolution -- the concept of evolution by itself explains all 18 these phenomena?</p> <p>19 A Well, if it is a covering theory of the biological sciences, 20 then in some sense it should, actually. I mean, and I think 21 that there's a sense in which, you know, when it's portrayed 22 in a sort of -- in a -- in a sort of a -- oh, like maybe in a 23 textbook, where it's presented as a kind of the covering 24 theory of all life, yes, there's a sense in which all the 25 other theories of the other biological disciplines are in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">204</p> <p>1 A That these different branches of biology require evolution 2 explain what they're doing.</p> <p>3 Q So you -- you -- you -- I think we need to be clear about 4 terminology here. Are you suggesting that the theory of 5 evolution is completely unnecessary to the --</p> <p>6 A Well --</p> <p>7 Q -- explanation of the phenomena that's described in this 8 paragraph?</p> <p>9 A I think for most of these sciences -- most of these sciences 10 have spent most of their existence independently of any kind 11 of evolutionary theory. And I think most of them today could 12 be conducted even if the theory of evolution by natural 13 selection and random mutation was called seriously into 14 question. All of them -- almost all of them could probably 15 survive pretty well intact because in fact the concept of 16 evolution isn't really relied on very much by the day to day 17 practitioners of these biological disciplines.</p> <p>18 Q And how do you know this?</p> <p>19 A Well, I mean, this is where I bring up this other character 20 Rasmussen in the next page, right. And there, right, he is 21 making a complaint about a book by Elliott Sober on the 22 philosophy of biology that in fact is really only about 23 evolutionary theory, and so he makes this point. Right. He 24 says, look at all these different branches of biology, they 25 could exist all quite independently without making any</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">203</p> <p>1 some sense explained by evolution to a natural selection. So 2 for example, let's look at the cell example from Behe, right? 3 Cytology, the science of cells, right, dates -- predates 4 Darwin, largely seen as beginning in the 1830's, 1840's, and 5 has gone about its own trajectory largely. And so not 6 surprisingly, Behe saw this as kind of a ripe target for 7 trying to say, look, you know, the reason -- you know, you 8 didn't need Darwin to have the science of the cells, and -- 9 and in fact, you know, you could have some other kind of 10 explanation for why cells have the kind of stability they 11 have because the science of cytology hasn't had -- hasn't had 12 to rely very much on evolutionary biology at all. Now, what 13 the evolutionary biologist has to say, and this is what they 14 do say against Behe, is that in some sense, cytology, like all 15 these other branches of biology are explanatorily subsumed 16 under random mutation and natural selection, that in some 17 sense, these are all applications as it were of evolutionary 18 theory. That is the goal if you have this kind of very 19 expansive sense that evolution is being the covering science 20 of biology. It's a bit like the way Newtonian mechanics was 21 when it was the covering science of physics. So in a sense, 22 it's quite recognizable what the -- what the aspiration being 23 expressed in the paragraph is. But it's just not true on the 24 ground. I mean, that's my point.</p> <p>25 Q But what's not true? I mean --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">205</p> <p>1 reference to evolution, and some of them could even do 2 perfectly well with assumptions that are contrary to 3 evolution, like Lamarckianism and even creationism gets cited 4 in this paragraph. And so from that standpoint, this is no 5 reputation of evolution, mind you. But it is saying that 6 evolution -- that evolution is kind of a theory that in a 7 sense has an independent existence of what goes on in these 8 different branches of biology.</p> <p>9 Q What about the work coming out of the human genome project? 10 Do you think that is -- relies on the scientific theory of 11 evolution?</p> <p>12 A Well, it certainly relies on DNA and genetics and so forth. 13 And there have been some linkages between that and the theory 14 of evolution, but they're relatively independent even that. 15 I mean, if you look at -- if you look at research published 16 on the human genome, I mean, what percentage of it is 17 actually making reference to evolution? I mean, human genome 18 is very important from the standpoint of manufacturing 19 pharmaceuticals and synthesizing, you know, amino acids that 20 can lead to all kinds of interesting other developments and 21 drugs and things like this. But exactly, you know, what 22 aspect of it connects up with evolutionary theory is 23 relatively small. I mean, obviously, there is -- 24 evolutionary theorists can find relevance in the human genome 25 project, that's for sure. Right. Just like evolutionary</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">206</p> <p>1 theory can find relevance in all the different branches of</p> <p>2 biology. But if you turn the question around and ask, do</p> <p>3 these branches of biology need evolutionary theory to conduct</p> <p>4 their business? The answer is, for the most part, no.</p> <p>5 Q That's true of the human genome project?</p> <p>6 A I don't think the human genome project requires the full, you</p> <p>7 know, theory of natural selection by random mutation in</p> <p>8 order -- in order to conduct its business. And in fact, the</p> <p>9 people who have been most instrumental in actually</p> <p>10 synthesizing the genome and doing stuff with it, right, I</p> <p>11 mean, they're not known as front line evolutionists. They're</p> <p>12 not necessarily anti-evolutionists, but that's not what they</p> <p>13 work in. I mean, I think it's a -- it's a kind of a -- it's</p> <p>14 a sort of presumption that gets made. I don't think it's --</p> <p>15 it's necessary. And the reason why I cited Rasmussen is</p> <p>16 because Rasmussen offers the evidence of looking at, you</p> <p>17 know, journals published in biological abstracts, which is</p> <p>18 the main kind sort of information science facility where all</p> <p>19 the main biology journals are located, and just look at how</p> <p>20 many of them make reference to the kind of terms you'd</p> <p>21 associate with evolution in their titles. And you find out</p> <p>22 that it's less than ten percent, okay, which is really very,</p> <p>23 very small. Now, I'm not denying that these biologists</p> <p>24 believe in evolution. I think maybe most of them do believe</p> <p>25 in evolution. But is the evolution actually intimately</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">208</p> <p>1 Design?</p> <p>2 A Well, I did this thing for the Open University, a collection</p> <p>3 of readings and commentary which is used as part of the</p> <p>4 master's in science program, science communication there.</p> <p>5 mean, the Open University, for the record, is a distance</p> <p>6 learning institution that has about 300,000 students in</p> <p>7 Britain.</p> <p>8 Q And what exactly did you -- what was your product?</p> <p>9 A Okay. Well, what -- it's so there would be some -- there</p> <p>10 would be some reading, some articles that represent the</p> <p>11 various sides of the issues, are science and religion</p> <p>12 compatible. That's the topic. And it's part of -- so it's</p> <p>13 part of the science communication course where students will</p> <p>14 be learning aspects about the public understanding of</p> <p>15 science, basically. In fact, I wrote this around the period</p> <p>16 I did this cyberconference here. And what I did was I</p> <p>17 collected together some stuff, including a chapter from a</p> <p>18 historical book on the relationship between science and</p> <p>19 religion, especially in the late 19th Century with Darwinism.</p> <p>20 Also have an article by John Angus Campbell in there on the</p> <p>21 need to teach the -- the Darwin creation dispute in the</p> <p>22 classroom. Also a piece by Eugene Scott, one by Behe, part</p> <p>23 of his Darwin's Black Box. Steven Weinberg, I think, is in</p> <p>24 there, too, as someone who is quite critical of design.</p> <p>25 Trying to think. Yeah, Larry Landan, that piece that Larry</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">207</p> <p>1 connected with the biological research that they do? Well,</p> <p>2 on the evidence of the journal articles and what they talk</p> <p>3 about, the answer would be no. And what -- and I make this</p> <p>4 point because my interest is in saying, look, we could have a</p> <p>5 serious debate about whether evolutionary theory is true or</p> <p>6 false or worth pursuing or whatever, without worrying that</p> <p>7 the rest of biology would go down the tubes if we were to</p> <p>8 seriously question it. Because what I worry is that the</p> <p>9 statement from the National Academy of Sciences is in fact</p> <p>10 kind of alarmist, right? Basically saying, you challenge</p> <p>11 evolution and there goes all these biological sciences. And</p> <p>12 I actually don't believe that's the case at all.</p> <p>13 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Pat, why don't we take like a five</p> <p>14 seven minute break. I think I'm near wrapping up. Probably</p> <p>15 worth calling the cab.</p> <p>16 MR. GILLEN: Certainly, good enough.</p> <p>17 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Okay?</p> <p>18 MR. GILLEN: Yep.</p> <p>19 (A brief recess taken at 3:55 p.m.)</p> <p>20 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:</p> <p>21 Q Steve, we discussed the article you wrote in Rhetoric and</p> <p>22 Public Affairs?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Other than that article, have you written other articles on</p> <p>25 the subject -- specifically on the subject of Intelligent</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">209</p> <p>1 Landan wrote criticizing Michael Ruse and his participation</p> <p>2 as an expert witness. And an article by -- or a chapter of</p> <p>3 one of Steven Carter's books about the role of belief in</p> <p>4 public life. Yeah, and the thrust of the thing was basically</p> <p>5 to make the argument that -- that -- that science and</p> <p>6 religion have historically been compatible, but that for</p> <p>7 specific reasons having to do with the legal system in the</p> <p>8 United States, this issue kind of flares up because of the</p> <p>9 separation of church and state. And -- and so the way the</p> <p>10 thing is arranged is you get these readings, and then you</p> <p>11 have my commentary, and then I do some questions that are</p> <p>12 meant for classroom discussion afterwards.</p> <p>13 Q So and your commentary -- I mean, you know, are they -- how</p> <p>14 would you characterize what your actual written product is as</p> <p>15 distinct from the other writings?</p> <p>16 A Basically laying out some of the assumptions, filling in some</p> <p>17 of the background detail, and sort of raising some</p> <p>18 problematic issues that the authors are, in a sense, perhaps</p> <p>19 not bringing to the surface. That kind of stuff. I mean,</p> <p>20 it's not meant to be a kind of advocacy piece, but rather to</p> <p>21 sort of explain why science and religion have been in</p> <p>22 conflict with each and why in a sense, there's a sense in</p> <p>23 which there are some very particular origins to this, that</p> <p>24 it's not necessarily inherent in the two things that they be</p> <p>25 in conflict with each other.</p>

210

1 Q And how would I get my hands on --

2 A Well, I think you -- I sent you a copy.

3 MR. GILLEN: I think we probably provided it to you.

4 MR. ROTHSCHILD: I don't think so.

5 THE WITNESS: Because I sent you a copy of it.

6 MR. GILLEN: I sent you --

7 THE WITNESS: I sent you earlier on.

8 MR. ROTHSCHILD: We don't need to -- you know, but if

9 you --

10 MR. GILLEN: If not, I will check, certainly, and make

11 sure you have it.

12 THE WITNESS: I sent it to you earlier on before I sent

13 all the other -- the stuff that was supporting this. I sent

14 it to you separately, maybe back in April.

15 MR. GILLEN: Okay. You want to take a break and see if

16 I can find it, while we're here? I'm sorry, I don't --

17 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Yeah, sure.

18 (A brief recess taken at 4:10 p.m.)

19 MR. GILLEN: Sorry, I can't find it.

20 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Okay. Well, let's handle it this way.

21 I would like to get a copy, I'm sure you can provide it. If

22 for any reason we need to reconvene we'll do it by phone.

23 MR. GILLEN: Okay, good enough.

24 (A brief recess taken at 4:12 p.m.)

25 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Let's just go back on the record. The

211

1 document -- the course materials that Steve's talking about I

2 believe were not provided to us as part of the expert

3 production. And we've reached an understanding that once we

4 receive those materials, if there's any need to reconvene the

5 deposition, we can do that by phone.

6 MR. GILLEN: I'm amenable to that.

7 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Okay.

8 BY MR. ROTHSCHILD, CONTINUING:

9 Q Other than what you've just described, we've talked about the

10 article in Rhetoric and Public Affairs that was reproduced in

11 Darwin, Design and Public Education, we've talked about these

12 course materials. Have you done any other writing on

13 Intelligent Design?

14 A I don't believe so. Let me think a minute. Can you give me

15 a moment to think about that?

16 Q Yeah.

17 A I have written on Darwinism in other places, so I have

18 written on the other side of the issue. Let me see. No, I

19 don't believe so.

20 Q Is it fair to say that the bulk of your study or research of

21 Intelligent Design was done in furtherance of preparing this

22 on-line course?

23 A Yes, I guess so. I guess that's correct. Yes, I --

24 certainly, that was where I got kind of the -- the basic

25 stuff on which I built, yeah.

212

1 Q Okay. And since that time when you compiled these materials

2 for the course, have you made a point of keeping yourself

3 abreast of the writings of intelligent -- of scientists or

4 philosophers or mathematicians who are proving the content

5 for Intelligent Design?

6 A Yes, yes. I do try to -- try to monitor that literature,

7 sometimes reading more deeply at other times, than others. I

8 mean, it's not that hard to sort of monitor the literature.

9 I was mentioning, you know, you may know this, the arts and

10 letters daily com on the web. That's -- which tends to sort

11 of excerpt various sort of intelligently oriented pieces

12 for magazines, newspapers and so forth. And they always are

13 picking up stuff in the Intelligent Design evolution

14 controversy where it arises. And then I sort of start

15 following up leads about what book has been published, and

16 what articles have been published and so forth, because there

17 are a lot of ways of finding out if one looks for it. So

18 it's not that hard to kind of get up to speed on these

19 things.

20 Q Okay. And -- but when you do this, I mean, are you actually

21 going and reading the source material?

22 A Yes, sometimes. Yeah, sometimes, yes. Not always, but

23 sometimes, yes. So like, you know, with Michael Ruse's book,

24 Darwin and Design, I read that. I'm going to be reading the

25 new book he's got out, Evolutionism. And yeah, but sometimes

213

1 I don't read -- I don't read everything. I don't read it

2 religiously as it were.

3 Q For, you know -- I mean, for example, have you, you know,

4 Dr. Dembski has written a number of books since his -- since

5 the Design Inference?

6 A Well, yeah. And many of them have been -- they've been

7 edited. I've sort of -- I've sort of ignored those. No.

8 Like I said, I'm not a religious follower of this literature.

9 I mean -- I mean, that's why I'm just not quite sure just how

10 far advanced they've gotten from the sort of major statements

11 and the major debates surrounding them.

12 Q Is it fair to say that you've followed the -- followed the

13 philosophical discussion of the topic more than the, for lack

14 of a better word, scientific writings?

15 A Well, on the surface the answer would be yes except that

16 these things are very closely intertwined, and that often,

17 especially with Dembski's work, you know, because he's a

18 mathematician, the philosophers who are quantitatively

19 oriented are often in the best position to kind of make the

20 salient criticisms of his arguments, more so than the

21 scientists are. So I kind of follow the criticisms where

22 they come from. But they do tend to be more philosophical

23 just generally. I mean, scientists' arguments are often not

24 quite as sophisticated. I mean, the philosophers have been

25 taking this stuff a bit more seriously.

<p style="text-align: right;">214</p> <p>1 Q Uh-huh. You refer, I think at footnote 11 to a book by —</p> <p>2 A Oh, yeah.</p> <p>3 Q — Thomas Woodward, Doubts About Darwin.</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q What is that book about?</p> <p>6 A Okay. This was a guy's Ph.D. thesis originally. And what it</p> <p>7 is, he basically followed various people around who've been</p> <p>8 debating the Intelligent Design/Darwin issue publicly. You</p> <p>9 know, so when Phillip Johnson and Stephen J. Gould were</p> <p>10 debating, I mean, he'd follow all these people across the</p> <p>11 country. And he's basically charting sort of the development</p> <p>12 and the arguments that are taking place. And one of the</p> <p>13 points that he makes is that in fact Intelligent Design</p> <p>14 people kind of have evolved, you might say, as they've</p> <p>15 interacted with scientists and they've made more</p> <p>16 sophisticated arguments and so forth. And so there's been a</p> <p>17 kind of learning curve, you might say, that now makes</p> <p>18 Intelligent Design a much more sophisticated theory through</p> <p>19 the interaction with the scientists. I mean, it's the kind</p> <p>20 of thing, you know, the sort of thing that John Angus</p> <p>21 Campbell kind of says would happen, he sort of documents</p> <p>22 And as a participant observer, which means that he's kind of</p> <p>23 there in the meetings, asks some questions, you know, and</p> <p>24 then writes about it.</p> <p>25 Q Do you have any relationship with Mr. Woodward?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">216</p> <p>1 A No, I have not.</p> <p>2 Q Why not?</p> <p>3 A Well, I don't — I guess I just — I haven't thought I was in</p> <p>4 a particularly persuasive position to convince the natural</p> <p>5 scientists about teaching anything other than what they</p> <p>6 already do. I mean, so it just didn't seem to fall to me to</p> <p>7 do that. I guess that would be the main reason. Also I do</p> <p>8 think there is this issue we keep on going back to about</p> <p>9 what's the appropriate faculty for discussing these matters.</p> <p>10 And that in the case of some of these things, that a</p> <p>11 mathematics or statistics department might be better than a</p> <p>12 chemistry or biology department for a lot of this stuff. So</p> <p>13 I think there's a kind of open question about where exactly</p> <p>14 would you want to be placing the study of this thing.</p> <p>15 Q Same question applies to the high school level?</p> <p>16 A Well, the high school level, the science courses are much</p> <p>17 more generic, aren't they? I mean, so — and also I think</p> <p>18 there's a different purpose as well, because at the high</p> <p>19 school level, there is a sense in which you're trying to seed</p> <p>20 the next generation of scientists potentially. I mean, that</p> <p>21 was something that even your guy, Alters, brought out. And</p> <p>22 that it becomes important then to think about the different</p> <p>23 scientific perspectives in light of that, whereas by the time</p> <p>24 you get to university, people are training to be</p> <p>25 professionals already in a given science. So they're sort of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">215</p> <p>1 A Do I have any relationship with him? I did teach this book</p> <p>2 in -- at UCLA when it was still in its proof form. I mean, I</p> <p>3 know — you know, and I have been in contact with him</p> <p>4 actually because he does derive some kind of methodological</p> <p>5 inspiration from some of my writings in the appendix of the</p> <p>6 book. But I've never taught the man, I've never met him</p> <p>7 personally. By the way, the context I would say where —</p> <p>8 where he is drawing some inspiration from me relates to the</p> <p>9 questions that you were raising earlier about the tributary</p> <p>10 delta stuff, about the idea of broadening out the scientific</p> <p>11 base so that larger numbers of people can have access to</p> <p>12 stuff. That's the kind of thing that he found initially</p> <p>13 attractive, which comes up in this book mine on Thomas Kuhn.</p> <p>14 Q I think you said very early in our discussion that</p> <p>15 Intelligent Design is not taught as part of the biology</p> <p>16 courses at Warwick University?</p> <p>17 A That's correct.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. And —</p> <p>19 A But we do teach, you know, in this philosophy master's degree</p> <p>20 thing, we do teach it. And so —</p> <p>21 Q Okay. But I'm correct that it's not part of any of the</p> <p>22 natural sciences curriculum?</p> <p>23 A No, no.</p> <p>24 Q Have you ever advocated at the university that Intelligent</p> <p>25 Design be taught as part of the natural sciences curriculum?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">217</p> <p>1 already engaged in a kind of more technical sort of thing.</p> <p>2 And that's — It's harder to institutionalize at that level.</p> <p>3 I think it actually would be easier to institutionalize at</p> <p>4 the high school level.</p> <p>5 Q Wouldn't it make sense at the undergraduate level, to seed</p> <p>6 the next generation of scientists, when the students are —</p> <p>7 A Well, okay.</p> <p>8 Q — sophisticated?</p> <p>9 A My — I should explain something. In Britain, you come in</p> <p>10 already specialized. I mean, you see, in America, it's quite</p> <p>11 common for the first year or two of the undergraduate level</p> <p>12 to in a sense be searching around for a major. And so, yes,</p> <p>13 in that context, I think that's a — that's actually right.</p> <p>14 So I take your point there. But I was thinking about the</p> <p>15 British context, right, where you sort of start</p> <p>16 specializing — you get admitted into a university in a</p> <p>17 subject. And that's why the degree program is a three year</p> <p>18 rather than a four year program.</p> <p>19 Q Could you turn to page 11 of your report.</p> <p>20 A Yeah.</p> <p>21 Q And at the bottom paragraph, you talk — you talk about most</p> <p>22 philosophers having resisted the charms of naturalism.</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And that's — I take it you're distinguishing them from</p> <p>25 scientists who, to a large extent, have succumbed to the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">218</p> <p>1 charms?</p> <p>2 A Yes, yes.</p> <p>3 Q And one of the things you say is that this refusal to commit</p> <p>4 to naturalism is less an ostrich like reaction to the</p> <p>5 inevitable march of scientific progress than an allergic</p> <p>6 response to guild-like arrogance of scientists. What do you</p> <p>7 mean by that?</p> <p>8 A Well, I mean, philosophers, I mean, people who remain</p> <p>9 philosophers and stay philosophers typically believe that</p> <p>10 none of the major questions about — that are associated with</p> <p>11 the nature of reality have been closed. And the problem is</p> <p>12 that the development of science out of philosophy, all the</p> <p>13 sciences come out of philosophy historically have involved</p> <p>14 closing down assumptions. You know, in other words, we're</p> <p>15 going to start with certain things as fundamental and then</p> <p>16 move on from there, and if you can't agree on those</p> <p>17 fundamentals, you're not part of the scientific team. And so</p> <p>18 physics does this, and now biology does this. And</p> <p>19 philosophers, generally speaking, want to keep an open mind</p> <p>20 about the fundamental foundations of knowledge being</p> <p>21 questioned. Okay. And so in that respect, they can't go</p> <p>22 along with science in that regard because science, typically,</p> <p>23 involves closing down at some point.</p> <p>24 Q And I take it that's part — that, to a large extent,</p> <p>25 explains your approach to this issue is a reaction to this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">220</p> <p>1 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Okay. And with that, off the record</p> <p>2 and thank you very much.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Thank you. Thank you. It was a lot of</p> <p>4 fun.</p> <p>5 (Deposition adjourned at 4:21 p.m.)</p> <p>6 ***</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">219</p> <p>1 guild-like arrogance of science?</p> <p>2 A Yes, I'm on the — yeah, I'm in a sense — yeah, I sort of am</p> <p>3 on the philosopher's side on this matter.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. And you suggest — you recall the figure of the</p> <p>5 skeptic who always imagines an alternative explanation for</p> <p>6 any apparently straightforward phenomena?</p> <p>7 A Yeah.</p> <p>8 Q And I take it that's where you find ID's place in the world?</p> <p>9 A Yes. I think that, yes, in the great scheme of things, yes.</p> <p>10 That's — yeah. With regard to especially these issues</p> <p>11 surrounding evolution.</p> <p>12 MR. ROTHSCHILD: I have no more questions.</p> <p>13 MR. GILLEN: Let me look in one more place for that.</p> <p>14 (A brief recess taken at 4:20 p.m.)</p> <p>15 MR. ROTHSCHILD: All right. Back on the record.</p> <p>16 MR. GILLEN: Sure.</p> <p>17 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Counsel for the defense has produced</p> <p>18 copy of the course curriculum for the Open University that</p> <p>19 Steve was referring to. And I'm going to take that copy.</p> <p>20 It's sufficiently lengthy that I'm not going to be able to</p> <p>21 process it in the short time before this deposition ends.</p> <p>22 And I think we'll just adhere to our agreement that if</p> <p>23 there's any need to reconvene the deposition just to — just</p> <p>24 for questions on this topic, we'll do it telephonically.</p> <p>25 MR. GILLEN: Yes. And again, I am amenable to that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">221</p> <p>1 VERIFICATION OF DEPONENT</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 I, STEVE WILLIAM FULLER, PH.D., do hereby certify that I</p> <p>4 have read the foregoing deposition taken on June 21, 2005,</p> <p>5 and that, to the best of my knowledge, said deposition is</p> <p>6 true and accurate (with the exception of the</p> <p>7 changes/corrections as attached hereto, if any).</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 STEVE WILLIAM FULLER, PH.D.</p> <p>12 Subscribed and Sworn to before me this _____ day of</p> <p>13 _____, 2005.</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 _____, Notary Public</p> <p>16 _____ County, Michigan</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 My commission expires: _____</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

1 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC
 2 STATE OF MICHIGAN)
 3) SS
 4 COUNTY OF MACOMB)

5 I, Robert E. Bouck, Certified Shorthand Reporter and
 Notary Public in and for the State of Michigan, do, hereby
 6 certify that the witness whose attached deposition was taken
 before me in the above cause was first duly sworn or affirmed
 to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and, nothing but
 7 the truth; that the testimony contained herein was by me
 reduced to writing in the presence of the witness by means of
 Stenography; afterwards transcribed by means of
 8 computer-aided transcription; and that the deposition is a
 true and complete transcript of the testimony given by the
 witness to the best of my ability.

9 I further certify I am not connected by blood or
 marriage with any of the parties, their attorneys or agents;
 10 that I am not an employee of either of them; and that I am
 not interested directly, indirectly or financially in the
 11 matter of controversy.

12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
 13 affixed my Notarial Seal this _____ day of
 14 _____, 2005.

15
 16
 17 Robert E. Bouck, CSR-3530
 Notary Public, Macomb County, Michigan
 My Commission Expires: 08-03-06
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

A	115:8,11,12,22 116:3,10,16 119:16,24 120:9 120:14 122:9,12 122:12,17,18,19 122:22,24,25 124:14,22 125:21 126:7,9 127:3,5 128:9,10 129:20 130:1 133:15 134:3,3,22 136:9 138:6 139:23,23 140:9,11,18 142:7 142:8 144:15,16 144:19,20,24 145:1,4,16 146:17 146:18,19 147:13 148:10,17 149:6,7 149:8,10,18 150:15 152:1,7,11 152:18 154:15,16 154:24 155:2 156:8,25 157:8 158:10 159:15,18 160:22 162:8,16 163:1,8 164:2,15 164:21 165:10,14 167:23 168:3 171:19 172:13 174:25 175:22 177:20 180:18 181:13 183:12,24 185:2,10,24 189:5 190:2 191:3 193:18,21 195:17 195:21 197:11 198:18,19 199:8 200:4 201:11 202:5 203:5 204:3 204:21,22 205:9 207:3,5 208:6,14 209:3 211:1,9,11 211:15 212:15 214:3,5,24 215:9 215:10 216:5,8,13 216:22 217:14,21 218:10,20 above 222:5 abreast 212:3 absence 130:21 185:4,16 absolutely 54:13 170:17 abstract 160:12 161:1 abstracts 206:17 abuses 26:15	Academy 144:15 academic 24:8 25:18 academy 94:24 96:8 96:23,23 97:7,11 144:22 191:5 207:9 accept 95:11 98:7 accepted 24:2 120:13 accepting 28:20,20 134:8 access 215:11 accessible 89:1 132:3 177:15 accident 33:11,14 63:18 accomplish 142:9 198:20 accomplished 141:25 accomplishes 176:17 according 23:4 53:20 117:8 account 64:9 79:7,8 88:13 102:19 105:3 106:6,7 107:1 109:4 accounts 102:18 106:5,9 accredited 163:24 accurate 39:10 104:18 116:6 221:6 achieve 112:19 acids 205:19 acknowledge 130:4 acknowledged 58:19 acknowledgment 25:17 101:11 acronym 143:11 146:22 across 114:3 214:10 act 14:21 17:4 action 1:7 118:16 127:6,21 128:10 170:13 active 175:18 activities 9:8 54:1 activity 37:14 actor 54:11 actors 126:5 actual 42:2 193:15 209:14 actually 4:11 12:9	15:25 17:20 24:5 24:24 26:7 30:13 31:22 35:16 36:2 39:12 40:7,8 45:1 45:17 50:25 52:6 52:12 53:25 54:5 55:10 61:12 63:16 64:10 68:11 70:10 72:14,24 74:9 77:5 87:25 89:5,5 90:21 92:24 93:8 97:14,15,17 99:25 102:4,8 103:15 111:18 112:21 119:23,25 121:13 122:19 123:23 125:25 126:6 127:25 128:23 134:18 144:1 147:8,8 152:15 155:1,24 156:13 157:25 158:14 163:7,23 164:16 166:11 167:17 170:5 172:9 175:18 176:6 177:3 178:4 183:1 183:9 187:13 188:13,14 189:7 189:20 190:21 191:11,12 196:5 197:8,20 199:5 200:8,22 201:4,6 201:18 202:1,5,11 202:13,20 205:17 206:9,25 207:12 212:20 215:4 217:3,13 ad 64:11 add 95:13 additional 191:20 address 3:20 64:4 addressed 163:4 addressing 80:22 adept 58:13 60:13 adequate 168:18 185:12 187:25 adhere 26:17 84:14 219:22 adheres 105:2 adjourned 220:5 adjusted 106:23 107:12 administration 145:3 admit 76:8 admitted 217:16	adopting 54:23 advan 189:5 advance 87:14 100:22 advanced 19:18 61:17 103:2 197:20 213:10 advancement 29:5 advances 101:5 advantage 75:16,17 76:6 164:25 185:24 advocacy 209:20 advocated 215:24 Affairs 151:19 207:22 211:10 affected 32:24 affiliation 8:18 134:21 affirmative 8:5 169:20 171:22 affirmed 3:6 222:5 affixed 222:13 Africa 86:2 after 30:12 64:22 92:21 102:24 109:11 129:16 131:3 136:18 140:12 149:24 177:1 179:8 afternoon 104:12,13 108:2 afterwards 8:12 102:12 209:12 222:7 again 17:13 46:8 55:21 62:8 64:15 67:22 71:15 98:25 105:25 106:12 108:1 120:25 125:5 129:22 135:9 137:21 149:9 153:5,8 154:11,12 155:23 164:21 180:24 190:23 191:1 195:16,17 219:25 against 63:4,10 124:21 174:15 186:24 199:4 200:6 201:5 again 203:14 age 71:3 72:13,25 73:5,11 98:25 agenda 35:4 agendas 84:12 agents 222:10
----------	--	---	---	---

agnostic 73:16 77:25 78:2 80:10 80:20 81:7 120:21 ago 6:17 25:25 34:18 35:9 41:1 43:10 45:21 52:22 91:25 149:9 177:21 agree 36:23 46:12 47:19 50:15 58:25 65:9 80:16,21,24 83:8 84:2 96:22 97:5 110:5 115:17 126:4,20 139:20 168:6 169:18 170:2 195:8,10 218:16 agreed 8:10 77:4 83:6 115:25 161:5 167:24 agreeing 75:21 111:1,10 agreement 8:9 219:22 agreements 30:2 ah 120:3 ahead 17:19 39:6 61:20 110:13 155:12,13 ah-ha 103:6 aim 185:1 aimed 53:1 ain't 176:2 akio 143:16 178:14 al 3:15 alarmist 207:10 alien 93:7 align 79:20 alive 16:25 allergic 218:5 allow 161:21 162:5 162:6 174:10 181:17,17,18 197:7 allowed 64:25 96:19 142:2 allowing 4:25 142:8 142:8 185:3 allows 64:19 126:6 allusions 129:23 all's 109:6 almost 51:9 102:8 129:24 135:10 204:14 alone 156:17 along 15:10 50:16 106:25 107:15	137:23 218:22 already 4:25 7:15 7:22 22:7 27:6 31:4 53:24 54:20 64:24 87:16 88:5 93:22 101:9 102:21 103:21 123:24 135:23 138:4 141:10 145:20 150:8 178:16 216:6,25 217:1,10 alternative 78:21 79:16 99:16,19 101:20 109:24 138:2,10 145:8 171:14 180:22 182:10 186:19 187:20 188:22 190:7 219:5 alternatives 144:25 171:6,23 Alters 216:21 always 21:2 31:24 37:2 69:7 164:24 165:5 167:21 170:20 171:13 174:25 212:12,22 219:5 ambiguous 136:4 199:24 ambit 101:12 amenable 211:6 219:25 amended 98:10 amendment 98:14 America 217:10 American 10:8 93:16 145:2 194:14 American's 145:23 amino 205:19 amongst 36:23 76:1 198:25 amount 14:2 180:19 amounts 177:16 analog 34:24 analogous 116:15 analogy 55:4 85:18 angles 74:1 Angus 40:6 70:20 150:20,23 208:20 214:20 animals 17:23 20:5 34:10 animating 177:7 Ann 1:16,24 3:1	announce 134:18 another 5:9 64:8 74:21 76:16 117:15 135:5 164:2 answer 4:22 5:8,11 5:11 17:17,18 18:20 29:24 38:7 39:5,6 40:17 42:3 46:11 57:7 58:17 67:16 100:7 105:15 123:22 124:8 133:14 145:20 206:4 207:3 213:15 answered 101:7,8 answering 67:24 answers 37:5 87:4 93:23 anthropic 116:20 anthropology 85:18 85:24 anti 185:19 anticipate 103:11 anticipated 40:11 anti-evolutionists 206:12 anybody 41:13 61:24 62:10 anymore 35:4 92:3 103:2 130:17 177:7 178:10 anyone 72:5 91:12 anything 7:24 10:19 35:14 41:25 42:23 44:14 47:11 51:6 65:13,23 66:2 111:12,25 129:14 130:6 153:17 154:24 159:12,13 160:24 188:6 216:5 anything's 46:15 apart 116:25 apologize 9:25 apparently 4:9 219:6 appeal 129:24,25 130:1 166:11 173:18 182:20 appealed 90:7 appealing 183:4 appeals 130:17 166:15 APPEARANCES 1:17 appears 40:4	appendix 25:23,24 150:13 215:5 applications 203:17 applied 61:13 62:6 62:18,22 85:23 87:5 114:3 142:25 applies 14:6 38:10 56:12 123:3,3 216:15 apply 35:10 36:3 62:10 65:6 99:14 179:15 applying 61:25 appreciated 112:15 appreciating 119:1 approach 87:24 160:18 218:25 approaches 17:22 112:25 114:17 approaching 113:18 113:18 158:11 appropriate 113:20 145:16 172:15 181:24 216:9 approval 156:3 approved 163:24 April 210:14 ARALENE 1:5 Arbor 1:16,24 3:1 Arch 1:20 area 1:8,9 3:16 14:5 19:20 24:14 27:7 27:16,17,19,25 28:1 30:5,16 32:7 32:8 38:24 49:12 58:11,13 59:1,8 63:7 72:24 75:15 97:23 106:17 190:25 areas 27:12 31:13 33:18,24 47:1,18 50:8 60:13 116:13 173:11 191:7 arguably 118:18 argue 85:14 182:19 argued 130:20 arguing 85:20 169:24,25 argument 22:17,21 53:22 55:9 66:25 69:24 91:2,12 122:19 149:23 157:4,6,8,12 170:21,22 171:1 174:15 176:2 209:5 argumentative	129:19 130:15 arguments 55:1,1 60:17 66:19 68:12 72:16 91:8,9 116:15 120:9 129:7 136:24 157:7 160:20,23 170:19 213:20,23 214:12,16 arise 26:2 81:12 120:11 arises 85:4 212:14 Aristotle 19:25 20:15 Arkansas 36:5 45:21 67:12 69:19 70:6 90:2 arose 81:17 82:21 125:11 around 34:10,13 54:17 74:16 96:18 99:2 101:22 123:23 125:3 163:22 174:8 178:4 179:11 196:8 206:2 208:15 214:7 217:12 arrange 86:23 arranged 209:10 array 10:4 17:21 50:25 arrived 14:6 arrogance 218:6 219:1 arsenal 129:19 130:15 article 24:8 28:10 28:20,24 29:2 142:22 143:3 150:24 151:4,14 152:4,10,13,17 156:2 166:1 173:16 178:12 207:21,24 208:20 209:2 211:10 articles 23:24 24:17 25:9 26:11,12 43:23 44:5 45:1 69:18 105:11,12 105:13 106:13 152:8,18,25 153:1 153:2 207:2,24 208:10 212:16 articulate 200:24 articulated 145:18 articulation 194:1
--	---	---	--	--

artifact 51:19 62:23 63:22 artifacts 52:3,10 53:4 60:23 artificer 156:7,7 157:23 158:23 arts 10:9 212:9 ascendant 147:12 Asia 86:3 aside 91:7 asked 7:20,21 8:11 29:21,22,22 43:2 149:10 asking 4:21 71:14 73:3 81:22 84:7 117:12 152:13 163:20 194:25 ask 214:23 aspect 61:13,25 62:7,11 95:3 155:14 185:5 205:22 aspects 28:21 62:18 126:25 154:3 161:17 208:14 aspiration 184:20 203:22 aspirations 113:8 aspires 115:17 117:24 aspiring 65:25 113:24 114:14 assert 95:13 140:11 asserted 77:17 170:13 assertion 101:25 102:5 159:15 187:3,11 assertions 94:1 assessed 125:9 assessments 112:19 assist 41:21 assistant 49:20 associate 12:23 15:2 16:4 197:12 198:2 206:21 associated 12:21 15:14 16:21 22:21 118:25 121:12 166:9 197:14 218:10 association 93:17 associations 196:24 assume 82:20 169:14 Assuming 194:8 assumption 125:19	125:19,20 assumptions 78:16 85:15 91:7 93:17 116:10 141:1 176:12 179:20 205:2 209:16 218:14 atomic 33:13 atoms 47:8 atrocities 197:4 200:8 attached 155:21 160:24 221:7 222:5 attain 100:19 attempt 22:22 50:24 90:1 194:12 attempting 133:1 attempts 51:10 attended 11:22 attention 42:7 76:5 192:23 193:13 attitude 157:17 198:13 attorneys 222:10 attraction 118:17 165:13 182:3 attractive 215:13 author 25:14 28:19 28:22 authority 14:19 143:22 180:19 authors 195:21 209:18 author's 26:13 automatically 180:2 autonomous 20:23 availability 197:6 available 171:14 181:2 199:13 avenues 187:7 avoid 36:10 132:8 174:8 avoiding 136:8 aware 9:7 11:11 39:24 40:18 41:5 41:8 42:24 57:13 61:24 62:10 100:8 109:17 away 24:25 76:10 76:18 92:5,6,13 92:13,22 108:9 113:3 191:15 195:24 a.m 1:14 3:3 42:18 87:1 a/k/a 146:2,22	149:16 B B 1:5 back 19:22 25:15 28:6,19 37:5 38:23 42:19 45:5 53:23 54:25 56:8 56:9 62:8 67:12 81:3 83:3 89:22 108:1 109:24 110:3,10 149:7 150:7,10 152:2 157:19 159:8 199:12,15 210:14 210:25 216:8 219:15 backbone 196:6 backdrop 88:2 backfilling 66:15 background 13:1 74:14 160:4 209:17 backward 53:10 bad 26:3 63:5 133:19 161:1 bailiwick 80:9 ball 103:2 bang 86:12 barldng 116:22 BARRIE 1:5 barriers 14:17 Barrow 116:21 base 123:16 215:11 based 25:24 35:9 72:16 83:13 107:8 112:19 126:22 196:3 baseline 123:5 basic 15:8 37:2 57:11 76:24 187:8 211:24 basically 15:21 17:23 20:17 22:2 22:8,11,13 25:15 28:8 36:1 37:15 50:15 58:2 94:11 106:3 107:1 108:7 124:19 152:22 166:21 179:2 185:10 189:23 207:10 208:15 209:4,16 214:7,11 basis 55:8,15 67:14 83:15,15 92:14 94:12 95:9,14 169:20,23 186:20	192:3,9 battle 106:9 185:2 bear 30:17 31:9 because 11:19 became 9:13 41:2,3 160:11 become 9:7 14:3,25 15:6 25:18 33:2 37:19,19 73:12 102:14 140:12 144:5 158:15 160:14 164:20 165:14 166:7 174:4 198:23 becomes 15:15 21:12 22:17,20 114:4 130:23 132:9 138:13 147:2 157:25 160:16,17,21,21 170:23 174:1 176:13 179:7,21 196:22 216:22 becoming 102:14 104:24 before 4:4,17 5:7 9:13 15:6 41:2,3 43:2 79:18 125:17 147:2 149:10 151:14 158:3 210:12 219:21 221:11 222:5 began 53:10 begin 23:23 beginning 16:6 18:7 19:23 38:20 53:13 203:4 begins 18:7 28:23 213:5 begun 103:18 behave 53:16 144:10 behavior 182:4 Behr 42:21,23 44:14 44:22 45:10 56:1 56:20 87:25 88:16 92:12 99:15,16 101:4 102:16 103:12 105:7,19 109:2,9 116:17 137:23 138:1 139:17 149:23 152:18 183:9,12 188:10 190:15 203:2,6,14 208:22 Behr's 44:22 57:8 66:6 87:18 92:5	104:20 105:5 109:15 115:3 132:15 137:6 150:8 152:10 153:2 168:6 169:25 170:3 193:19 behind 120:19 162:2 being 3:17 7:1 8:12 15:16,17 18:24 19:5,9 20:21 27:2 42:10,13 45:20 46:10,13 48:22 52:23 53:1 55:19 57:12 60:1,19,19 60:23 64:13 65:20 67:11 68:5,8 69:15,22,23 73:8 77:1 85:22 91:13 93:12 99:20 101:7 101:8,15 103:4,25 110:20 111:3,3 113:4 115:13,14 116:3,20 118:21 120:9 124:17 126:10,18 127:3 127:11,16 128:2 128:15,16,18 130:20 136:15 139:12,15 142:1 143:20 144:11 145:20,25 155:25 156:10 171:12,22 173:25 177:13 178:7 179:18 180:17 186:7 188:19 190:14 194:22 195:3 196:5 198:21 199:9 200:12 203:19,22 218:20 beings 55:5 85:1,3 85:20 156:16 bel 181:7 belief 11:1 133:10 153:16 175:2 209:3 beliefs 90:6 131:21 132:6,7,11,12,16 133:2,16 134:12 134:14,15,18 141:23 192:2 200:25 believe 6:11 7:13 11:13 16:15,18,19 37:25 43:11 71:20
---	--	--	--	--

72:22 75:23 84:7 88:23 89:4 117:5 119:4 124:7,8 128:21,24 130:7 133:21,22,23 142:20 152:19 158:12 171:14,15 183:15 184:7,22 184:24 192:4 200:22 201:4,7 206:24,24 207:12 211:2,14,19 218:9 believed 22:6 believer 16:16 125:24 believes 28:16 72:5 125:15 134:4 believing 158:19 belong 137:17 below 141:17 benchmark 20:1,14 51:22 63:10 140:8 benchmarks 62:4,5 beneficiaries 33:11 benefit 122:5 136:12 180:5 benign 200:17,23 201:2 besides 159:12,14 187:24 best 27:1 39:21 53:7 140:24 166:17 167:8,13,19,21,24 168:5,21 169:4 171:12,15,20 183:25 213:19 221:5 222:9 BETH 1:4 betray 140:19 better 84:8 162:20 163:21 168:9 213:14 216:11 between 17:9 21:25 23:6 50:4 59:22 69:22,22 75:25 84:2 92:7 113:23 128:5 131:4 132:21 150:14 155:22 156:9 177:6 178:9 205:13 208:18 beyond 120:12 139:24 163:6 175:13,19 biased 28:16 96:18 96:21 178:16 biases 25:9	Bible 129:21 130:17 130:20 biblical 67:13 68:4 68:14 82:1 84:15 89:14 90:3,6 153:17 big 25:25 33:7,8 58:2 68:16 85:19 86:12 87:16 160:11 179:3 191:9 196:2 bigger 55:7 76:3 136:21 bill 31:3 billions 71:8 biochemist 115:3 biochemistry 46:23 48:16 biological 20:3 33:17 34:4 47:24 52:24 53:6,9 54:11 56:13 61:13 61:25 62:11,19 78:9 81:1 101:25 123:18,23 125:4 156:9 159:12 162:20 163:21,24 164:17 165:18 168:13 202:19,25 204:17 206:17 207:1,11 biologist 32:7 48:1 163:25 203:13 biologists 18:13 21:2,10 75:23 77:6 165:23 189:19 206:23 biology 10:14 11:12 11:12 17:15,20 18:5,8,9,17 19:5 19:19,20 20:16,20 21:16 30:10 32:5 33:24 34:7,12 46:21 47:20,22 48:2,7,18 66:11 66:17 75:21 77:17 77:21 78:12,13 88:10,12 97:25 110:16 111:15 114:4,20,22 116:14,25 125:8 137:14,18 138:22 181:8 183:3 185:6 190:9 201:12 203:12,15,20 204:1,22,24 205:8 206:2,3,19 207:7	215:15 216:12 218:18 biology's 19:2 bit 4:19 13:21 17:13 73:20 112:20 113:14 119:2 124:9 125:2 127:24 130:11 133:4 140:9 157:17 163:8 164:5 167:12 203:20 213:25 bits 189:14 Black 44:15 104:20 105:9 193:19 208:23 blasphemous 156:24 blood 222:10 blueprint 52:16 81:19,21 82:13 blueprint's 52:16 blurring 119:25 board 1:9 3:16 53:24 board's 141:22 Bob 4:22 5:5 104:9 182:15 body 27:7 179:23 180:22 186:20 boils 176:3 bold 189:13 bomb 33:13 book 12:21 43:9,23 44:1,5,7,8,19,24 45:8 78:6 91:16 91:18 104:20,21 124:12 136:18 147:1 150:8,24 151:2,17 193:19 204:21 208:18 212:15,23,25 214:1,5 215:1,6 215:13 books 25:22 45:4,6 124:13 148:15 193:19 209:3 213:4 both 12:7 13:16 17:13 44:25 84:10 88:17 94:6 113:5 170:6 174:18 182:21 186:10,14 197:9 200:17 bother 101:1 132:11 bottom 88:6 94:3 97:24 98:3 113:6	137:7 143:10 185:23 186:6 217:21 Bouck 2:1 222:4,17 bought 70:5,6 boundaries 135:24 175:19 boundary 119:25 156:9 boundary's 127:3 Box 44:15 104:20 105:10 193:19 208:23 boy 25:5 bracing 156:10 branches 18:23 116:12 147:4 182:22 183:20 184:4 203:15 204:1,24 205:8 206:1,3 break 5:14 14:16 42:16 102:6 104:7 181:6 182:12 207:14 210:15 breaking 64:16 breaks 5:16 breath 76:10,18 brief 42:18 87:1 104:8 182:14 199:11 207:19 210:18,24 219:14 bring 12:14,18 31:9 47:17 65:12 90:3 109:3 143:3 163:16 164:3 204:19 bringing 9:12 85:14 101:12 148:18 156:12,13 190:5 209:19 brings 13:2 101:8 Britain 208:7 217:9 British 7:23 217:15 broad 98:5 181:11 191:13 broadening 215:10 broader 16:10 31:1 broadest 77:21 broke 176:2 brought 30:17 64:13 81:8 107:11 216:21 BRYAN 1:3 build 123:10 built 211:25 built-in 116:9	bulk 211:20 bunch 15:22 100:23 164:2 burden 124:9 business 56:20,22 88:4 112:18 125:3 156:14 162:13 206:4,8 buy 44:1 134:7,7 C cab 207:15 call 3:24 4:1 14:3 20:3 25:4 34:4 39:14 48:9 54:22 65:18,19 69:6 75:4 127:15 129:10,25 144:1 201:17,21 CALLAHAN 1:5 called 14:10 18:4 31:19 32:15 45:13 69:7,15 78:6 110:20 111:3 150:25 204:13 calling 76:19 110:19 119:2 154:14 207:15 calls 98:19 Cambridge 43:10 came 43:25 74:21 91:18 104:20,21 106:21 140:6 camouflage 90:11 Campbell 40:6,12 40:13 70:20 150:21,23 208:20 214:21 campus 11:18 canonical 73:9,24 capabilities 120:23 121:18 123:18 161:9 capacity 4:7 159:12 162:6 190:17 capital 110:23 captioned 3:15 car 52:14,14 cards 129:13 care 45:22 132:18 carpeting 109:6 carried 36:8 carry 189:10 190:1 190:13 191:8 carrying 72:22 Carter's 209:3 case 6:15 7:21 8:17
---	---	---	--	--

25:14 32:22 36:3 36:5 39:24 40:18 40:19 41:5,9,14 41:18 45:10,10,16 45:21 47:17 52:19 69:20 70:6 72:3 90:2 93:3 99:15 100:12 108:12 109:2 111:6 112:9 139:11,20 144:12 154:10 155:19 161:5 166:24 169:20 170:13 171:22 175:10,20 192:12 207:12 216:10 cases 4:9 26:10,21 60:14 cast 25:8 200:11 category 133:12 Catholics 192:5 caught 113:9 causal 52:7,18 causation 117:9 118:23 127:2,7 cause 178:10 222:5 caused 66:20 67:3 149:18 159:14 causes 16:1 67:1 159:14 cell 88:1 99:17 105:24 121:6 137:9,12,25 167:14 172:4,5 187:20 188:2,10 188:14,16,16,16 188:21 203:2 cells 88:3,10,14 188:19 203:3,8,10 cellular 56:21 cell's 173:11 Center 1:23 7:7 8:15 29:21 central 14:3 73:12 centralized 34:21 century 18:8,20 20:2 22:4 33:2 38:21 47:7,15 85:19 140:5 160:9 179:9 200:8 208:19 certain 15:1 19:18 21:7,15 25:9 26:8 53:12,17,20 59:25 60:14 65:17 88:5 106:4 116:12 118:11,12,22	119:1 120:18 133:17 136:16 137:11,11 147:18 155:21 159:1 162:4,4 163:13 172:10 173:11 181:16 184:15,15 188:2 191:7 218:15 certainly 7:15 17:12 42:17 46:6 48:1 69:15 85:10 86:25 89:3 98:24 112:9 115:20 116:8 119:12 120:9 126:6 127:15 153:13 158:9 185:7,17,18,20 194:21 195:11 205:12 207:16 210:10 211:24 CERTIFICATE 222:1 Certified 2:1 222:4 certify 221:3 222:5 222:10 challenge 63:24 65:10 166:4 170:20 176:4,11 182:4 184:5 207:10 challenged 99:21 103:10 challenges 100:6,16 103:14 168:24 171:2 challenging 116:9 189:15 chance 51:17 56:25 59:19,23 107:9 193:9 change 20:5 45:19 89:19 113:8 115:10,18 117:25 126:19 132:8 136:3 changed 35:1 107:4 148:6 150:4 157:17 changes 14:9 21:1,9 21:19 121:8 125:14 172:6 188:4,18 changes/corrections 221:7 changing 35:7 115:9 117:23 124:4	158:18,18,21 160:4 channel 19:17 chapter 208:17 209:2 chapters 44:2,18 character 35:7 100:2 130:8 195:25 204:19 characteristic 16:8 48:14 characterization 195:6 characterize 27:24 76:18 87:4 122:1 139:21 149:18,19 209:14 characterized 22:1 98:23 characterizing 57:24 147:16 charge 152:8,24 Charles 191:4 charms 217:22 218:1 chartered 15:23 charting 214:11 check 210:10 chemical 86:14 102:8 chemically 102:6 chemist 32:7 102:25 chemistry 10:14 32:5 46:17 47:3,5 47:13 48:7 216:12 Christian 190:22 193:25 Christianity 131:21 199:2 CHRISTY 1:3 church 209:9 circumstance 174:23 175:1 circumstances 4:15 cite 78:6 93:9 cited 205:3 206:15 cites 39:12 105:13 citizens 143:17 144:10 Civil 1:7 civilization 17:3 140:21 cladistics 77:23 claim 38:18 103:1 105:8 202:5 claiming 79:3 202:8 claims 15:14 38:12	38:12,16,19 39:1 39:16,22 46:9 104:17,24 107:18 109:21 110:1 179:17 196:21 200:24 clarify 38:7 152:11 clashes 172:17,18 class 11:12 50:4,6 98:1 112:18 classes 10:17,20,22 11:12,16 49:24 50:1 classic 108:12 109:21 classification 76:14 77:18 80:25 classify 76:12 classroom 90:4 131:1 208:22 209:12 clear 5:6,13,14 8:10 16:15 17:14 27:5 27:23 30:5 31:7 33:8 48:23 53:2 56:3 58:8 90:9 116:8 120:11 127:8 134:4 136:3 138:14 195:2 196:22 204:3 clearer 77:25 clearly 9:13 46:16 86:5 135:22 153:21 close 101:9 118:13 118:14 125:1 closed 118:16 218:11 closely 12:21 16:21 27:3 202:10 213:16 closer 37:11 closes 119:1 closing 218:14,23 cognate 124:25 coherent 166:23 coin 101:7 coined 18:8,9 20:21 cold 29:18 33:20 colleagues 132:17 collected 208:17 collection 208:2 College 9:18,23 colloquy 4:23 Columbia 48:3 com 212:10 combat 166:17	combination 83:10 combinations 27:21 combine 47:10 come 8:7 21:3 27:1 28:11 43:13 51:17 52:9,11 57:19 64:8 74:13 75:5 79:9 81:14 99:15 101:24 102:17 108:1 115:6 123:14 124:22 131:6 133:25 138:2,10 139:23 145:3,3 147:1 151:8 164:9 166:21 176:8 181:11 185:12,15 188:14,24 200:21 213:22 217:9 218:13 comes 25:10 52:6 66:16 82:13 83:11 83:14 108:25 131:21 180:24 215:13 comfortable 3:23 95:7 coming 19:11 57:2 87:22 99:13,23 102:17 108:10 109:1,1 131:18,24 132:5 165:12 179:13,22 184:9 191:12 205:9 comment 30:12 commentary 208:3 209:11,13 commissars 198:23 commission 221:17 222:18 commit 202:12 218:3 commitment 147:9 commitments 88:11 174:22 committed 68:13 116:4 117:7 119:14 121:11 182:11 common 14:25 18:6 23:9 57:23 74:4,6 74:10,11,13,25 75:5,6,9,13,24,24 76:4,10,20 77:2,4 77:5,19 79:3,5,7 79:13,17 80:1,1,4 80:7,17 81:6,14
--	--	---	---	---

82:24 114:16 118:22 127:1 160:18 179:23 199:1,1 217:11 communicated 22:10 communicating 198:16 communication 208:4,13 community 41:14 135:7 136:1 176:11 177:5 comparison 47:3 49:6 67:9 101:6 compatible 45:14 121:14 192:6 208:12 209:6 compensation 7:5 competence 32:3 competency 27:9 competent 29:14 30:20 31:12 competing 84:3 113:15,16 138:6 180:15 competitors 167:22 compiled 212:1 complaining 110:19 complaint 42:2,3 94:15,20 204:21 complete 52:18 222:8 completely 26:19 74:24 93:6 128:20 204:5 complexity 54:21 56:21 57:9 58:3,9 59:7 87:19 88:12 99:18 106:8 124:14,23 125:11 137:24 139:13 162:25 167:13,19 168:4,8,25 187:6 187:10,15 complicated 19:2 components 188:2 comports 131:7 133:10 composition 102:5,9 comprehensive 166:23 comprised 57:8 88:22 computer 18:1 53:8 53:14,15,20 54:4 101:20 124:15	125:4 157:21 158:16,21 159:7 161:17,21 162:1 162:11 163:13 177:22,24 188:13 computers 55:2 101:14 159:4,13 160:14 162:6,15 computer-aided 222:8 concept 57:15 83:25 84:4 85:7 87:5,19 97:8 99:12 100:18 100:22,23 106:21 114:5 143:11 176:22 194:10 202:17 204:15 conception 18:6 47:7 94:11 114:3 116:24 120:18 123:2,7 133:23 conceptions 113:19 113:22 concepts 103:20 119:10 conceptual 99:10 112:12 136:16 147:13 159:22 conceptualizing 65:22 125:8 conceptually 100:15 100:15,24 concern 130:21 156:13 concerned 12:8 14:1 78:10 115:12 180:25 concerning 144:9 145:17 199:25 concerns 33:3 101:9 101:9 125:13 173:13 200:13 conclusion 15:5 160:2 164:10 166:1 conclusions 14:7 27:11 32:9 54:10 137:11 145:4 conclusory 170:15 concrete 162:17 condition 21:10 140:14 conditions 32:19 82:21 100:4 107:10 175:2 conduct 197:5 206:3 206:8	conducted 18:24 55:2 120:9 138:9 204:12 conducts 46:16 conference 143:7 conflict 173:10 configurations 86:14 confirm 47:18 109:15 conflate 110:6 conflict 209:22,25 conforms 133:15 confronted 103:13 confused 42:20,25 91:23 148:24 149:1 152:11 confusing 111:10 confusion 43:3 conjecture 190:2 conjunction 67:15 163:13 connected 33:14 34:8 117:2 161:18 207:1 222:10 Connecticut 9:21 connection 131:13 connections 70:21 91:19 92:3 connects 205:22 consensus 74:2 consequences 118:9 162:4 consider 11:8 49:12 50:9,13,13,19 54:16 58:8,14 59:6 63:8 65:16 71:6,8 93:7 116:14 135:14 152:8,24 153:5 155:14 194:19 195:14 196:10 consideration 31:6 55:24 126:4 considerations 86:6 109:3 145:6 considered 15:5 38:25 59:1 71:12 114:7 125:1 126:18 considering 101:3 119:19 considered 60:25 consistent 74:24 75:5 76:23,25 79:8 133:1 146:6 consistently 75:10	79:5 131:20 consolidate 179:6 consolidated 147:25 180:11 consolidates 180:13 consonant 193:25 conspiracy 201:5 constantly 78:15 constituted 177:15 constituency 24:18 constituted 176:6 constitutes 92:16 197:22 constraints 57:1 122:13,15 158:24 159:1 161:24 162:4,13 163:2 184:10,11 consult 7:10 consulted 144:4 consulting 43:1 consumer 33:23 consuming 24:23 contact 8:14 40:5,9 128:4 177:14,18 215:3 contacted 7:14,19 8:3 contacts 8:13,20 contained 122:3 222:6 contemporary 160:3 content 26:12 44:7 50:20 56:6,6,10 72:8 73:6 95:13 128:19 154:24 163:15 212:4 contention 30:7 contest 17:6 60:13 179:20 contested 75:15 contesting 78:15 context 20:20 22:20 24:10 131:15,15 131:15,16,25 132:10 154:18,18 164:7 177:5 184:5 194:24 195:11,16 196:16,17 215:7 217:13,15 continue 97:3 103:12 104:4 117:14 continues 112:7 continuing 3:25 5:24 7:18 23:16	39:23 42:22 49:3 61:18,23 67:20 69:1 71:10 74:8 82:6,14,25 84:20 85:6 87:2 92:11 93:25 94:19 96:4 97:21 100:13 104:11 106:25 107:15 108:16 109:13 111:5 121:16 122:21 124:3 126:15 129:15 135:12 137:4 139:3 141:11 142:15 146:21 147:15 148:7,25 151:13 153:11 154:2,19 155:11 156:1 166:1 169:17 171:17 177:8 181:5 182:17 192:21 193:5 195:1 196:9 198:5 199:20 207:20 211:8 continuum 21:25 contrary 201:6 205:2 contribute 27:6 189:20 contributing 198:22 contribution 135:25 contributors 93:8 control 35:4 controlled 100:4 controls 163:22 controversial 26:22 27:13 69:9 controversy 74:18 212:14 222:12 conventional 47:21 conversation 5:2,4 40:17 conversion 37:6 converting 178:18 convey 143:19 convictions 131:7 194:1 convince 216:4 cooks 85:12 Coperacus 179:4 copy 6:16 44:19 97:15 210:2,5,21 219:18,19 cordon 196:23 core 56:12 88:19
---	--	---	--	---

174:24 corpus 83:6 correct 4:4,5 22:14 36:25 37:3,22 38:1 42:11 46:3 47:20 48:1 52:21 59:9,11 61:15 62:25 63:22 64:2 67:21 79:23 87:10 95:15 97:10 108:7 117:11 119:11 126:11,14 129:4 139:14 155:6 161:7,8,10,12,20 164:10 168:16 169:16 180:4 201:12 211:23 215:17,21 corrected 107:16 correction 29:8 107:17 corrections 24:5 corrective 176:16 176:20 correctly 5:19 31:8 84:13 94:5 168:5 197:15 corresponds 146:19 corroborating 129:17,21 cosmological 172:23 cosmology 116:13 116:15 117:1 155:21 cosmos 114:12 counsel 5:20 219:17 count 60:20 counted 60:14 counter 109:2 counterexamples 61:1 63:3 64:10 64:13,17,20 65:1 65:2,4,12 66:1 99:9,10,13 102:19 105:4 107:11,13 107:14 109:1 country 68:3 196:7 214:11 counts 97:10 County 221:16 222:3,17 couple 7:16 25:25 44:1,18 52:22 56:4,4 59:4 67:7 69:18 100:8 course 29:8 33:1 38:15 48:2 53:11	64:23 68:10 92:20 120:17 123:24 124:8 125:20 127:17 148:4 176:18 183:10 189:24 196:13 208:13 211:1,12 211:22 212:2 219:18 courses 11:4 12:24 215:16 216:16 court 1:1 13:20 104:10 132:19 172:25 182:16 cover 60:21 189:23 covered 20:5 78:13 covering 56:18 114:6 167:6 173:6 202:19,23 203:19 203:21 covers 19:20 60:22 coy 119:2 123:25 co-edited 40:5 co-extensive 136:1 co-taught 10:24 crash 63:18 cre 116:4 create 5:10 95:14 156:16 158:2 190:11 created 23:1 81:11 84:16 88:14 119:18 155:22 156:18 160:9 162:8 creating 54:11 161:25 creation 22:10 66:23 67:13 68:3 74:12 81:9 82:1 82:15,23 84:15 85:2,4,7,16 86:6 86:10 89:21,24 90:1,14,20 91:25 96:2 101:5 148:13 152:23 153:16 155:19 162:13 169:21 208:21 creationism 67:9,16 67:18,23,23,25 68:11,16,21,22,24 68:25 69:2,24 72:21 85:23 89:10 89:11,25 92:8 95:23,24 141:22 146:3,7,10,10,15 146:20 147:4,6,20	148:19 149:16,21 152:7 153:2,6,20 153:22 154:1,3,5 154:14 155:4,14 155:18 205:3 creationism's 166:2 creationist 149:4 153:15 154:5,21 154:22 creator 23:2 55:13 69:7,7 121:12 154:9 155:2,5,16 155:19,22 158:2,8 158:10 161:22,23 161:24,25 200:22 creature 126:10 credentialed 18:3 credibility 50:8 160:19 credible 186:17 187:4 crisis 143:15 criteria 16:15 36:17 36:22 37:3,9,23 38:1 46:8 74:20 75:6,8 98:19 132:3 184:25 196:23 criterion 57:18 166:13 critic 120:6 critical 11:25 14:17 48:22 136:1 208:24 critically 61:10 121:24 criticism 106:22 107:1 108:3,20,24 108:24,25 109:5 109:18 124:16 132:4,8,19 173:2 195:24 criticisms 105:1 213:20,21 criticism's 132:5 criticize 107:24 132:6,17 criticized 122:10 136:18 criticizing 132:16 172:14 209:1 critics 63:13,16 65:3 90:16,17 91:5 100:16 102:17 107:21 168:25 critique 138:17 cross-listed 50:4	crucially 129:18 crystallize 165:21 crystallized 18:7 147:3 CSR-3530 2:1 222:17 cult 14:13,25 cultishness 133:18 cultivating 181:3 cultural 194:13 195:11,19 198:22 core 34:2 current 83:6 179:15 181:6 182:4,8 currently 84:5 88:21 118:21 162:21 178:13 curriculum 23:10 curriculum 23:22 23:23 110:16 111:15 215:22,25 219:18 curve 214:17 cut 5:8 cyberconference 25:25 142:19 143:4 208:16 cyberconferences 150:17 CYNTHIA 1:4 cytology 203:3,11 203:14 D D 1:5 2:3 daily 212:10 Dalton 47:6 daming 64:14 darning 65:8 110:2 dance 146:17 Daniel 125:23 Darwin 90:24 91:17 124:13 191:4,6 203:4,8 208:21 211:11 212:24 214:3 Darwinian 201:17 201:18,25 Darwinism 66:11,25 67:4 83:4 115:5 140:5,7 150:25 191:2,16 208:19 211:17 Darwinists 125:24 Darwins 140:2 Darwin's 44:15 83:11 104:20	105:9 110:20,23 112:6 193:19 208:23 data 145:3 183:7 DATE 1:13 dates 203:3 Davies 116:21 dawned 40:3 day 67:13,23 68:4,8 68:13,22 74:11 89:13 95:24 131:10,25 134:10 148:19 149:24 153:16 162:9 176:18 196:20 204:16,16 221:11 222:13 days 16:4 91:23 177:16 dead 140:5 deal 32:23 44:17 73:21 90:24 91:8 102:15 107:12 128:17,20,22 197:1 dealing 20:16 27:12 79:16 128:15 137:6,17 183:2 dealt 107:13 debate 46:14,15 207:5 debated 16:2 104:1 debates 21:4 165:21 213:11 debating 91:6 214:8 214:10 DEBORAH 1:3 decent 122:19 decide 37:10 44:24 80:19 decision 24:4 144:8 decisions 145:18 decisive 170:25 decline 33:20 deep 125:6 deeply 45:6 212:7 default 171:1 defeating 141:3 defeats 142:10 defendants 1:10,22 6:15 29:21 35:12 defense 37:20 219:17 defensive 36:12 define 13:3 16:12 96:15 defined 30:24 60:15
---	---	---	--	---

93:16 98:4 110:24 135:24 175:3 defining 72:8 93:19 definition 31:10 47:25 94:10,24 95:6,10,11,18 96:9,22,24 97:3,5 97:8,10 98:7,10 98:14 99:9 106:23 107:17 126:23 definitions 70:2 97:1 definitively 99:24 deformations 136:5 degree 45:22 215:19 217:17 degrees 109:10 deliberately 51:2 delta 178:20 179:21 215:10 demarcate 37:16 demarcation 35:17 35:20 36:1,7,10 36:14,17 37:3,14 131:13 166:13 Dembs 170:5 Dembski 11:6 40:21 42:20 43:3 44:13 44:21 45:16 56:1 56:22 59:18 63:1 63:24 64:16 65:6 65:10,14 70:24 85:13 87:23 91:6 92:13 99:7 101:4 102:16 103:12 104:25 106:20 109:9 114:23 116:17 122:16 123:22 127:25 130:6,7 136:20 139:16 149:23 170:5 183:10,23 184:21 190:15 213:4 Dembski's 11:14,15 11:25 40:23 42:21 42:24 43:7 44:10 57:10 58:14 59:10 66:6 85:15 87:3 91:3 92:5 104:21 109:16 115:3 120:10 123:10 132:15 136:18 147:1 158:11,12 159:3 163:16 184:12 213:17 Dembski/Behe	70:15 demonstrate 100:24 169:1 demonstrated 77:7 demonstrates 158:7 demonstrating 168:8 denigrate 111:2 Dennett 125:23 deny 139:9,9 145:12 denying 172:1 206:23 department 9:25 10:2,3,6,24 11:7 11:20 216:11,12 departments 28:5 189:7 depending 75:10 79:20 90:8 131:23 144:17 depends 56:16 64:14 66:4 77:20 102:12 121:22 135:20 140:1 187:13 195:16 DEPONENT 1:12 221:1 deposition 2:14,15 2:16,17,18,19 3:17 4:17 5:20 6:3 6:9,12 21:4 23:14 49:1 94:16 97:19 110:9,12 142:13 151:11 192:17 195:22 211:5 219:21,23 220:5 221:4,5 222:5,8 depositions 41:18 41:20 derive 82:22 215:4 derived 144:3 descended 18:6 descent 74:4,6,10,11 74:18,25 75:5,6,9 75:13,24,25 76:4 76:7,10,20 77:2,5 77:19 78:20 79:3 79:5,14,17 80:1,4 80:7,18 81:6 82:24 describe 19:19 43:7 described 13:1 110:23 204:7 211:9 describing 102:9 142:22 description 121:18	161:6 deserve 16:20 design 9:5,9,14 10:16,19 11:3,11 22:16 27:15,24 30:9 31:2 38:11 38:22 40:2,14,17 40:24 42:13 43:10 43:14 44:3 45:20 46:5,25 47:4 50:9 50:10,14,20,23,24 51:1,7,8,12,13,15 51:25 52:3,13,20 52:22,23 53:3,6 53:15,23,25 54:5 54:9,17,20,23,24 55:8,11 56:7,12 56:18,22 57:15,25 59:3,19,24 60:14 60:20,21,23 63:6 63:12,17 65:17,18 65:19 66:8,12,22 66:25 67:8,18 68:5,17,21 69:6,6 69:8,11,13 70:16 70:23 71:3,6,16 71:22,23,24,25 72:4,8,10,12 73:4 73:4,8,16 74:5,16 75:1,3,15 76:4 81:5,16,21 83:25 84:4,9 85:8,10,11 86:10 87:9,11,21 87:24 88:20,21 89:9 90:13,19,21 91:17,19 92:2,8 92:15,24 93:1,6 93:11,15 95:21 96:11 98:12,17,23 99:6 100:9 101:22 104:15,21 107:7 108:19 112:13 113:24 114:11 115:12,15,17 116:8,11,15,18 118:15 119:22,24 120:3,8,14,15,23 120:24 121:24 123:2,3,12,17,18 124:4,7,13,20,22 125:12,20 126:2,4 128:22 130:3 131:6 136:8 138:18 139:21 140:9,11 141:21 142:1,7 146:2,7 146:13,16,19	147:5,11,11,16,17 147:25 148:3,11 148:16,18 149:4 149:18 150:2,6,25 151:5 152:1,3,19 153:6,14,21,25 154:4,8,21,25 158:14,15,19 159:18 160:18,20 160:22 161:5 162:15,21,24 163:5,10,13,18 164:7 168:8,21 169:4,21 170:19 170:21,22 171:1 171:21,22,25 172:13,21 173:7 176:8,15,21 177:4 180:24 182:3,7 183:7,14 184:11 188:8 189:6,8 191:15,22 192:10 193:21,23 194:6 194:11,13 195:8 195:12,14,17 197:11,13 198:11 198:21 200:22 208:1,24 211:11 211:13,21 212:5 212:13,24 213:5 214:13,18 215:15 215:25 designed 23:4 51:20 53:19 55:18 61:14 62:1,12,24 63:9 64:1 138:3 172:5 188:25 designer 120:16,24 121:5,15,17,19 122:3,12,24 123:7 126:9 155:5 161:6 161:19 169:21,22 170:14 designers 54:19 designing 52:5 Design's 107:18 Design/Darwin 214:8 despite 21:1 detail 17:17 126:7 209:17 details 179:16 189:10 Detecting 43:10 determination 62:23 123:17 determine 24:20	38:24 62:1,12 63:25 65:5 198:11 201:22 determined 172:17 172:18 determines 30:22 187:13 determining 125:6 develop 133:1,9 134:11 135:1 162:5 172:19 173:2,14 186:25 187:13 developed 12:10 55:25 57:12 70:14 71:12,24,24 92:15 93:22 97:9,11 120:20 139:15 166:8 180:14 196:10 200:5 developing 34:15 38:15 131:5 135:16 195:13 development 19:4 20:4 33:4 34:5 47:2,4 89:15 90:10 91:1,4 97:7 114:19,22 158:6 178:17 214:11 218:12 developments 22:23 30:10 205:20 develops 16:9 66:4 73:20 157:25 device 114:6 devices 101:15 devout 82:2 diabolical 26:6 die-hard 125:23 differ 75:25 difference 23:6 69:22 150:14 155:22 differences 113:10 115:7 198:25 different 12:17,17 18:2,3,4,23 19:6,6 19:7 21:16,17 25:3 28:1 55:14 57:3,5 66:3,21 68:9 70:1 71:5 74:1 75:11,21 76:14,15 78:12 79:20 82:4 86:15 86:16 87:20,22 90:13,16,19 96:25 99:3 112:11,25
--	---	---	---	--

113:14,19,22 114:8,14,18,24 115:1,8,16 116:24 121:8 125:21 131:23 132:5 137:22 139:6 141:1 143:1 144:18 145:17 147:4 157:6 164:3 164:13 165:4 167:5 169:23 172:6 173:9,13,13 174:10 179:13,18 179:19,22 180:1 180:14,15,23 181:1,12,22 182:1 191:12 192:1 201:3 202:9,9,13 204:1,24 205:8 206:1 216:18,22 differentiate 198:7 differentiation 17:9 differently 67:3 90:16 163:9 164:5 172:22 194:23 difficult 5:5 27:17 27:19 96:24 189:4 198:17 difficulty 137:2 dimension 12:14 dimensions 12:8 13:16 200:17,19 diminishing 129:18 130:14 dipped 43:22 44:12 direct 101:15 112:4 177:18,24,25,25 192:23 directed 20:7 141:21 direction 46:6 54:20 64:20 87:16 93:5 101:23 122:4,6 125:21 138:20 180:1 directions 57:3 87:22 179:14,19 180:14,23 182:1 191:12 directly 80:12 109:21 222:11 DIRECTORS 1:9 disadvantage 189:22 disagree 76:1 disagreed 35:15,16 disagreement 76:11	77:18 disagreements 76:19 78:17 disappear 178:10 discarded 177:9 discarding 28:15 77:18 disciplinary 144:21 discipline 10:10 13:23 28:8 58:25 disciplines 13:2 17:21 28:4 31:13 80:22 114:3 116:10 189:7 202:25 204:17 discouraged 191:16 discourse 122:4 discovered 112:8 discoveries 178:16 discovery 8:18,20 9:1,7 93:18 130:11 131:15,17 154:18 194:3,5,9 195:7 196:17 discuss 142:2 143:8 discussed 11:5,7,15 49:10 60:6 66:5 67:11 68:8 121:24 126:13 141:25 145:18 207:21 discusses 91:19 discussing 15:13 87:3 92:25 123:24 130:25 216:9 discussion 43:13 45:5 70:23 122:9 145:12,23,23 148:16 193:3,18 209:12 213:13 215:14 discussions 78:22 disease 34:2 disentangleable 148:10 dislike 196:19 dismissed 90:7 display 37:14 displays 51:7 dispute 85:19 177:1 208:21 disputes 19:1,12,16 dissatisfied 162:22 162:23 disseminated 14:14 dissimilar 10:7 distance 118:17 127:7,21 128:10	208:5 distinct 119:8 209:15 distinction 69:21 89:17 92:7 119:16 119:17,18 131:4 131:14,14 132:21 135:11 177:6 178:8 distinctive 57:4 85:3 distinguish 17:5 36:17 37:23 111:13 196:16 distinguishing 18:17 217:24 district 1:1,2,8,9 3:16 97:23,25 112:17 disturbances 178:11 disturbing 128:11 divergent 34:17 diversify 179:14 diversity 31:18 201:8 divided 116:10 divine 23:2 81:19 121:12 154:9 DNA 53:13 205:12 Dobzhansky 93:9 dock 68:6 doctrine 84:15 147:17 149:16 doctrines 146:2 147:14 182:11 document 23:17,21 97:22 111:14 142:16 143:2 150:10 192:14 193:9,11,14 194:2 194:8,17,23 195:3 198:15,18,18 199:14 200:15 201:6 211:1 documents 6:9 41:21 196:4 214:21 dogma 75:7,13,14 141:3 180:20 181:6 dogmatic 89:19 165:9,14 175:11 176:10 dogmatism 133:16 176:17,20 doing 13:17 17:9 24:24 26:8,21 27:9,11 30:15	39:19 45:23 52:14 53:24 54:4,21 55:12 61:6 62:3 64:17 66:22 97:4 99:11 101:1 102:18 103:17 106:11,16 109:7 113:2 117:21,21 119:24 125:4 127:8 130:6 133:11 134:25 135:21 138:17 139:17,22 154:14 154:17 158:21 159:3,3 165:3,4 165:24 167:7 169:23 173:10 176:9 177:21,23 178:5 181:22 183:2,12 197:13 200:20 204:2 206:10 domain 51:5 176:13 dominance 193:24 dominant 33:18 68:2 89:4 116:6 117:10,17 179:12 179:25 dominating 174:13 done 29:17 32:18 52:14 60:9 61:19 63:1 64:12 66:7 66:14 85:25 86:19 86:20 87:17,17 91:3 101:14 102:15 105:18 121:20 123:25 124:12,17,24 125:2 127:12,16 129:6,11,13 139:12 150:17 155:25 157:21 160:15,16 167:3 183:9 187:9 188:6 189:2,3 211:12,21 door 124:25 181:19 doubt 166:3 193:3 doubting 175:23 Doubts 214:3 Dover 1:8,9 3:15,16 41:13,15,19 42:13 97:23 110:3,5 141:13 142:6 down 4:23 13:21 14:16 17:13 25:19 61:5 80:4,5,7 87:24 102:6	148:11 162:4 176:3 183:18 188:24 199:23 207:7 218:14,23 downbeat 112:20 dozens 33:6 Dr 3:10 6:20 35:12 39:24 40:2,12,23 42:24 43:3,7 44:10,14,21,22 63:24 65:6,10 66:6,6 87:3,18 104:20,21 106:20 141:20 152:18 213:4 draw 32:9 76:5 89:16 129:17,21 132:21 135:11 160:2 drawing 53:24 69:21 137:11 215:8 drawn 44:7 127:3 160:6 draws 90:22 Drive 1:15 driven 33:23 drop 19:22 dropped 86:3 drugs 205:21 dueling 106:9 duly 3:6 222:5 during 34:20 108:11 dust 140:13 dynamic 38:9 46:8 dynamo 160:9 D-e-m-b-s-k-i-11:15 E E 2:3 3:5,5,5 222:4 222:17 each 4:25 5:3 18:17 81:10,15 84:15 85:22 116:25 172:14 173:1 174:12 192:6,13 209:22,25 earlier 35:11 37:5 47:2 66:23 67:9 67:15,25 68:10 72:21 87:15 89:10 89:11 95:25 96:7 116:16 123:24 156:13 157:21 161:20 183:24 186:22 210:7,12 215:9
---	---	---	--	---

<p>early 18:10 22:3 47:7 85:19 87:12 87:19 88:17,20 97:6,6 139:5 147:2 190:21 191:6 215:14 earth 71:3,6,17 72:6 72:13,18,25 73:5 73:12 114:10,12 178:5 easier 13:20 107:24 135:20 157:25 158:9 160:21,21 217:3 easily 33:25 37:17 73:10 91:23 148:9 easy 31:21 32:22 180:16 echos 37:5 eclipsed 33:17 ecologically 34:7 ecology 17:22 edited 150:25 213:7 editor 25:4,11,11,12 28:12,12,14,18 40:6 editors 28:14 educate 66:7 education 31:14 49:22,24 50:1,5 146:3 150:25 198:24 211:11 Edward 2:1 effect 25:8 109:2 119:18,19 158:6 198:14 effective 27:14 143:18 effectively 145:6 170:3 181:6 effects 125:6 effort 34:23 either 16:16 48:1,25 60:4 107:9 136:12 139:10 191:16 222:11 electric 160:13 element 25:16 189:1 elementary 49:16 88:7 elements 47:8,9 elicited 109:18 eligible 137:3 elina 170:3 eliminate 170:11 eliminated 169:15 170:3 171:5</p>	<p>eliminating 167:22 Elliott 204:21 elsewhere 119:13 200:16 emerged 83:19 emotional 129:24 130:1 emphasizes 56:20 empirical 12:8 13:5 13:7,13 55:17 86:1 94:13 101:13 101:15 109:22 112:4 123:5 126:20 127:10 139:12 177:12,18 182:20,23 188:10 empirically 55:20 86:7 100:9 108:10 177:14 employ 183:19 employee 222:11 employing 182:21 enable 162:12 196:25 enables 60:12 174:6 encourage 97:3 112:21 179:18 180:13 181:21 encouraged 165:7 encouraging 180:21 end 7:14 24:21 25:8 26:7,12 35:1 74:11 75:11 91:17 102:17 112:20 119:12 131:10,25 134:10 159:9 162:8 164:23 175:5 176:18 177:23 188:15 196:19 endeavor 5:7 ended 89:8 endorse 142:5 endorsing 142:3 ends 14:13 219:21 endurance 5:13 enemy 199:5 enemy's 199:5 energy 160:10,13 enforcing 75:22 engage 26:7 engaged 28:9 53:25 217:1 engaging 109:8 enjoy 17:18 enough 36:21 56:11 121:6 130:23</p>	<p>136:14 172:11 207:16 210:23 entail 24:11 entailed 122:23 enter 80:12 89:6 entered 36:4 entering 120:4 enterprise 133:13 134:22 135:6,16 enters 201:1 entertained 127:18 entire 76:19 77:19 entirely 150:8 171:8 171:10 entities 127:17 entitled 143:3 entity 127:23 entree 124:11 entrench 102:20 entrenching 37:17 environment 21:1 172:7 188:4 environmental 21:19 34:9 121:8 188:18 epistemically 111:4 epistemological 186:16 epistemology 12:4 13:2,3,4,24 14:5 32:8 50:7 142:24 equal 132:20 equating 108:3 147:20,22,22 equation 127:25 Eric 1:19 3:13 4:1 escape 149:16 especially 11:5 26:21 30:12 31:25 45:4 54:3 66:11 85:17 131:19 136:4 165:9,18 166:7,16 175:16 181:13 208:19 213:17 219:10 essay 40:4,7 150:23 essential 202:8 establish 27:7 75:8 79:5 established 14:19 22:7 28:3 96:21 141:10 190:25 establishes 74:18 establishing 20:14 75:6 establishment 165:14 166:5</p>	<p>et 3:15 eugenics 196:11 197:17 Eugenie 208:22 Europe 16:1 EVELAND 1:4 even 9:11 14:25 20:7 26:16 36:6 39:21 40:19 41:15 48:13 54:16 62:10 73:2 78:15 79:5 104:4 118:18 125:17 130:10,24 134:21 148:10 156:6,15 169:18 170:10,11 171:22 172:24 175:25 177:19 195:20 196:14 197:12 204:12 205:1,3,14 216:21 event 16:6 events 159:13 eventually 41:16 86:3,8 171:16 176:21 ever 4:6,10,13,17 6:14 8:20 40:1,16 41:13 55:17,19 89:21 130:12 171:4,4 215:24 everybody 37:2 160:9 everybody's 55:22 132:20 everyday 160:7,15 everything 20:8 60:22 66:3 73:10 106:7 117:8 146:18,19 161:23 213:1 evidence 37:11 60:3 69:5 75:7 85:25 89:20 90:9 112:7 113:13 116:19 122:11 126:17,20 150:1 159:23 173:21 179:17,21 181:4 182:20,23 183:2,17 188:10 206:16 207:2 evidential 129:25 evolutionist 38:18 evolution 38:11 59:1 68:3 69:19 72:24 74:24 75:4 77:3,21 78:2 79:4</p>	<p>80:6 83:3,4,7,8,16 83:18,22 93:13 94:3,6 95:19 96:9 98:10,15 113:4,5 117:1 162:20 164:8,9 172:24 186:17,24 187:3 187:20,24 201:12 201:18,25 202:8 202:14,17,17 203:1,19 204:1,5 204:12,16 205:1,3 205:5,6,11,14,17 206:21,24,25,25 207:11 212:13 219:11 evolutionary 38:19 46:21 62:6 73:10 74:13,19 75:7,11 75:13,19,23 76:7 77:17 78:11,13,22 79:1,2,6,14,19,21 84:8 88:2,11 93:2 93:4,4,8,21 105:23 106:4,5 114:19,22 124:17 125:2,8 126:3 132:23,25 163:7 163:21,25 165:22 170:20 171:1 179:17 183:3 186:9 187:11 188:7,22 190:9 203:12,13,17 204:11,23 205:22 205:24,25 206:3 207:5 Evolutionism 212:25 evolutionists 18:10 57:6 72:18 79:16 89:8 99:18 138:17 166:17 172:13,23 173:8,10 177:19 181:3 189:15 206:11 evolution's 55:21 evolved 214:14 exact 43:11 82:23 128:5 exactly 18:21 28:13 56:17 64:17 74:18 74:25 75:24 84:1 109:10 111:8,8,8 136:10 137:3 146:16 147:12 195:20 205:21</p>
--	--	--	---	---

208:8 216:13 Examination 2:6 3:8 examined 3:7 example 11:12 18:21,22,23 20:25 26:10 30:6 38:18 44:22 58:19 62:22 67:1 70:5 72:17 72:23 79:21 82:17 86:4 93:9 99:8 102:24 105:13 112:3 115:13 116:3,11 124:11 127:2,20 134:1 135:13 137:5 143:25 144:25 145:2 146:2,18 153:14 160:8 165:17 166:15 167:13 170:12 174:16 183:22 203:2,2 213:3 examples 60:24 63:11 65:6 87:6 109:17 153:2 184:21 except 47:2 213:15 exception 221:6 excerpt 212:11 exciting 89:1 141:5 141:9 exclude 65:18 exclusive 93:1,12 186:11,15 exclusively 89:3 exclusiveness 99:20 executed 187:22 188:5 exemplify 140:21 exhibit 2:14,15,16 2:17,18,19 23:11 23:14,17 94:14,16 97:19,22 142:12 142:13,16 151:4 151:10,11 192:17 EXHIBITS 2:13 exist 16:20 86:16 93:19 123:19 130:5 204:25 existence 9:12 22:18 204:10 205:7 existing 31:4 exists 14:18 17:20 84:5 128:23 163:3 exited 110:9 exotic 63:11 115:5	expand 169:24 175:13 expansion 33:19 expansive 203:19 expect 32:23 137:5 137:16 190:15 202:16 experience 31:14 experiment 47:22 108:11 132:6,7 133:24 experimental 17:24 experimentation 16:3,24 experiments 127:5,8 127:16 128:22 129:3,10,11,11 178:6 expert 4:3,4,6,7 6:10,14,15 7:1,9 8:4,5 24:14 27:22 29:20 30:17 31:13 35:11 41:5,23 47:19 48:15,25 49:4,12,21 50:9 50:10,12,19 56:6 58:8,10,10,14,17 58:18,20 59:7,8 62:13 103:16 113:9 149:12,14 209:2 211:2 expertise 30:4,16 31:9 32:7 47:17 47:19 55:24 69:20 80:20,25 expertises 18:3 experts 41:19 42:8 55:24 80:9 expires 221:17 222:18 explain 12:6 15:4 23:7 32:17 44:23 50:24 62:6 65:13 65:23 66:2,3 76:22 77:2,3 79:19 84:8,9 88:1 99:17 106:5,7 107:3 113:16 114:17 118:7 125:14 138:5 143:19 156:11 166:25 167:11,17 168:1,2 173:11,21 177:19 202:5,10 204:2 209:21 217:9 explained 4:20	32:15 53:3 107:9 167:5,25 184:16 203:1 explaining 114:25 123:23 137:24 explains 11:1 34:3 79:4 103:7 163:20 202:17 218:25 explain 185:11 explanation 79:9,20 79:21 95:2 98:4 99:19,20 110:25 120:5 138:6,7 162:20 166:17 167:3,8,9,10,14 167:17,20,21,24 168:9,18,21 169:5 171:12,15,20 173:4 183:24,25 184:14 185:4,5,17 186:8,12 187:25 188:23 201:17 203:10 204:7 219:5 explanations 78:22 79:1,6,14 80:5 99:16 105:24 128:25 155:15 164:16,19,22 168:9,13 169:24 173:18 176:23 184:7,22 185:3,21 explanatorily 203:15 explanatory 43:13 56:23 57:10,11,13 57:14 58:3,15 59:4,13,16,21 61:13,25 62:11,17 63:25 64:4,9 87:5 91:4 94:11 99:9 105:1 106:21,22 113:13 114:2 122:16,23 123:10 123:16 139:13 158:11 162:2 163:17 184:12 186:20 187:2,5,8 explicitly 91:7,18 explored 141:7 expose 112:24 141:6 expressed 203:23 expression 115:23 115:24 146:14 extension 52:1 extent 53:12 67:4 85:2 147:18	200:21 217:25 218:24 external 32:19 33:9 extra 97:15 extract 76:21 extreme 124:20 160:20 200:15 extremely 133:6 eye 45:16 F F3:5 face 21:19 78:13 91:8 173:21 188:17 189:11 faces 186:24 facie 20:19 facilities 5:15 facility 206:18 facing 170:20 fact 8:25 18:5 23:8 26:4 40:3,4 43:12 43:17 53:7 54:9 54:15,17 57:21 63:1,13 64:18 65:12,13 74:17,20 74:22 75:14 77:24 79:4 87:13 88:9 91:21 94:3,6 96:19 99:23 100:2 100:20 101:1 102:5 105:15 106:6,11 108:19 109:8 110:19 111:1,3,6,7 112:8 113:4,6 114:10,18 122:8 124:1 128:3 130:18 132:10,15 132:21 134:16 138:21 144:17 146:10 150:3 151:18 154:12 155:1 161:25 164:22 165:16 179:9 180:10 181:19 183:16,24 184:3 186:23 187:19,24 189:16 190:10 194:8,18 195:22 198:22,24 200:14 201:3,7,22 203:9 204:15,22 206:8 207:9 208:15 214:13 facto 64:14 factors 33:9 35:5,7 181:20	facts 41:14 95:3 96:20 112:13 faculties 10:8 faculty 10:4,11,11 216:9 fair 9:15 56:11 60:24 69:10 73:1 73:17,22 87:4 94:7 105:7 106:23 109:18 113:23 115:19 134:23 136:14 137:12 139:4,25 149:6 153:3 162:21 164:15 165:12 174:21 182:2 183:6 190:11 201:14 211:20 213:12 fairly 14:8 16:2 27:8 88:10 148:3 Fairness 173:17 faith 16:15 fall 25:15 60:15 216:6 falling 60:25 falls 137:14 false 69:22,25 102:21 138:7 207:6 falsify 174:19,23 familiar 21:23 30:6 40:20 92:19 101:2 105:6 182:22 183:20 190:24 192:14 familiarity 59:12 139:18 152:3 familiarized 44:21 families 86:16 famous 41:2,3 far 8:22 19:10 50:16 61:17 64:6,6 68:6 68:8 73:13 87:7 92:25 108:17 116:25 142:4 180:24 183:6 189:15 191:15,21 213:10 far-fetched 54:2 158:3 fascinated 21:2,3 fascinating 112:22 fashion 17:5 74:14 128:3,20 167:15 191:14 fast 140:1
---	--	---	--	--

father 81:20	210:19 219:8	104:23 213:12,12	formulation 16:4	364,17,18 37:12
fault 99:4	finding 212:17	214:7	Forrest 192:15	37:16,24 39:24
Fe 124:18	fine 32:3 38:8 64:12	follower 213:8	forth 9:10 24:6	40:18 41:9,13,19
February 7:14,19	105:3 172:14	following 110:17	33:19 66:14 70:3	42:9 43:21,23,25
8:14	finish 4:25 5:6 6:24	142:19 149:11,13	86:3 88:3 91:2,14	44:2,7 45:21 46:3
feel 17:18	13:3 92:12 161:16	212:15	96:20 106:17	52:6,21 53:4 57:2
fell 133:12	finite 92:23	follows 3:7 65:9	114:16 133:18	57:5,8 64:24 66:4
fend 107:14	firm 3:14	94:5 170:15	143:1 144:9,20	66:16,17,24 67:17
FENIMORE 1:3	first 3:6 7:13,19 8:3	food 143:25	157:25 160:14	72:21 74:1,13,21
few 7:15 15:3 99:25	9:7 12:7,20 22:18	fools 25:20	173:4 177:21	75:9 76:20 80:2
148:12 158:4	44:25,25 55:23	footnote 214:1	181:4 182:10	81:15,17,18 82:22
189:13 192:22	56:4,17 59:17	forays 189:14	196:19 205:12	83:11 86:2 87:22
field 12:5,7,19 17:15	60:11 66:10 67:8	force 21:7,13	212:12,16 214:16	87:23 90:23 93:2
18:11 24:7,16	69:10,13 70:4,19	166:20 194:14	forum 131:2 145:16	94:24 101:2 102:9
28:3 38:2,3 48:14	79:9,18 90:21	forced 25:19 109:9	151:14 195:25	103:20 108:9
70:9 77:16 78:8	91:9 92:18 101:1	forcing 133:17	forums 181:24	113:3 115:4,6
107:21 137:14	103:22 108:24	162:16	forward 14:20	116:25 117:12
141:5 163:22	110:4,14,15,15	foregoing 221:4	91:22 99:11 104:2	123:6,11,14
165:25 182:21,24	112:5 114:23	forever 102:15	109:3 134:16	125:13 129:17,21
183:8	124:13 129:19	forgot 43:11	140:18 154:8	131:24 132:5
fields 12:17 18:2,18	135:11 137:19	form 19:12,19,21	173:14 189:13	137:12 138:8
19:6,14 25:18	140:6,7 143:10	21:1,18,22 39:3	190:8,13 191:8	140:2,4 141:1,5
28:2 31:19 32:15	150:17,20 152:10	46:11 54:11 61:20	fossils 53:11 90:6	147:3 148:12
101:10 115:2	156:2 157:12	64:19,25 67:19	found 36:11 44:25	149:24 150:2
116:19 202:9	168:24 182:18	68:1,2,23 71:9,25	62:23 100:20	154:8 155:19
fight 190:12	185:3 217:11	72:4,21 74:7	149:6 215:12	156:14 160:2,6
fighting 185:2	222:5	81:14,24 82:4,9	foundation 179:7	165:3,8 167:22
figure 27:10 37:9	firsthand 139:18	82:11,19 85:3	foundations 13:6,8	174:7 176:22
72:20 128:7	fish 136:21	86:7 87:14 91:3	13:9 25:23 127:10	177:22 178:20
136:13 162:9	fit 13:22 21:25 31:3	92:10,17 93:19	218:20	179:5,23 180:5
174:11 219:4	61:2 63:15 65:16	96:3 100:10 108:6	founded 12:5,19	182:22 183:7,20
figured 175:12	107:17	108:17,21,25	13:23	185:20 191:12,12
file 144:17	five 43:10 193:15	121:1,21 123:20	founders 93:10	191:15 194:2,3
filed 42:2 94:15	207:13	126:12 135:8,19	four 53:19 92:23	195:24,24 196:17
filling 141:9 209:16	fix 176:2	135:23 136:10	111:17,21 193:14	198:7 202:13
filter 43:13 56:23	flagship 10:10	139:2 140:16	217:18	203:2 205:4,18
57:10 58:3,15	flares 209:8	146:7,8 147:7,21	fourth 112:16	207:9 208:17
59:13,16,21 60:25	flavor 130:12	148:22 153:7,23	141:16 193:15	209:15 213:10,22
61:6,8,13,25	193:11	154:6 155:7,17	frame 164:4	215:5,8 217:24
62:11,18 63:25	flavors 131:22	166:16 169:13	framework 23:9	218:16
64:4,9 87:5 91:4	flaw 65:21	171:9 176:24	46:5 117:23	front 45:8 64:16
99:9 105:1 106:22	flip 45:8 152:6	177:13 180:7	186:19,20 187:1,2	165:18,19 206:11
114:2 122:16,23	flourish 21:9	182:5 194:20	187:4,8,11	fruitful 164:19
123:10,16 139:13	flow 180:6,9	195:15 215:2	Frank 1:15	165:5
158:11 162:3	flowing 179:4	formalization 99:12	FREDERICK 1:5	fry 136:21
184:12 187:5	flytrap 102:7	format 3:22	free 165:25 174:10	fuel 163:19
filters 163:17	focus 157:12 169:3	formation 82:22	friend 199:5	fuels 163:11
final 90:12 112:15	193:13	forms 14:1,24 16:11	fringe 27:12,16,16	full 31:18 35:4
financially 222:11	focused 42:7 78:17	21:8 45:3 51:8	27:24 175:21	47:12 65:16 113:5
find 34:1 85:25	114:9	55:25 66:17 67:9	from 3:13 4:3 9:9	145:11 152:6
111:25 112:22	foe 199:1	67:15,25 68:10,11	10:7 12:15 13:12	156:2 161:23
116:14 136:25	follow 17:14 27:12	70:14 74:12,13	15:16,24 16:6	185:23 186:4,5
137:1 149:5	67:7 107:10 169:6	82:22 89:10,11	17:6,8,11,21 18:6	191:8 192:25
157:12 167:22	169:7,9 170:17	108:14 120:13	18:25 19:5,9,23	199:23 206:6
173:24 176:7	172:12 213:21	127:2 129:18	20:23 21:21 24:25	Fuller 1:12 2:5,14
186:3 205:24	214:10	140:24 156:9	27:5,18 31:21	2:15,16,17,18,19
206:1,21 210:16	followed 64:15	177:20	33:7,21 35:8,11	3:10 23:11,14,17

94:14,16 97:19,22 142:11,13 151:11 192:17 221:3,10 Fuller's 173:17 Fuller 97:22 fully 21:21 121:11 141:7 187:22 188:5 fully-fledged 189:21 fun 220:4 function 182:8 functions 53:15 fundamental 47:8 57:11,20 65:21 73:25 79:4 113:10 116:5 140:24 176:12 218:15,20 fundamentalism 200:5,9 fundamentalist 66:13 192:7 fundamentally 141:1 fundamentals 218:17 funding 33:21 34:22 funny 69:14 further 103:25 222:10 furtherance 211:21 fussy 101:13 future 64:7 101:19 107:15,21,24 140:19 165:10 179:15 180:12 182:10 futures 181:1	66:10 78:10 93:20 113:23 145:11 148:13 153:9,15 158:15 178:17 185:2 197:7 198:13 generality 57:16 112:10 generalize 31:21 generalizing 31:23 generally 20:24 21:10 24:23 28:17 48:6 67:6 86:11 149:2 160:19 213:23 218:19 generate 101:20 163:23 generated 96:1 101:21 144:7 generating 183:7 generation 190:7,12 191:20 216:20 217:6 generations 141:10 189:16 generator 160:13 generators 160:10 generic 216:17 genetic 74:19 geneticist 93:11 geneticists 196:13 196:18 197:16 genetics 49:4 83:13 140:6 196:3,5,7 197:4,6,21 205:12 genome 205:9,16,17 205:24 206:5,6,10 genuine 136:9 Germany 196:2 gets 18:7,8 20:11,11 30:24 60:17 61:1 75:7 85:13 101:14 125:18 146:11 160:13 183:17 205:3 206:14 getting 15:23,23 24:5,8 26:12 35:1 37:11 47:10 58:16 70:25,25 75:11 81:3 89:17 107:23 112:13 156:11 162:18 Gillen 1:23 3:23 5:15,22,25 6:2 7:12 8:2 39:3,6 42:17 49:2 61:16 61:20 67:19 68:23	71:9 74:7 81:24 82:9,19 84:19,23 86:25 92:10,17 96:3 97:16 100:10 104:6 108:6,21 110:9,12,13 121:1 121:21 123:20 126:12 129:5 135:8,19 139:2 140:16 146:8 147:7,21 148:22 153:7,23 154:6 155:7,17 169:12 171:9 176:24 180:7 182:5,13 193:2 194:20 195:15 198:4 199:18 207:16,18 210:3,6,10,15,19 210:23 211:6 219:13,16,25 give 7:11 29:12 47:3 77:13,14 79:7,7 85:17 91:9 115:7 124:11 135:13 146:16 151:22 162:1 175:1 199:15 211:14 given 6:16 14:5 38:12 39:15,20 45:22 57:19 72:19 88:2,19 103:4 106:16 109:20,25 112:24 136:5 140:13 167:20 180:16,18 216:25 222:8 gives 110:25 114:24 141:8 195:11 giving 22:5 82:11 125:25 154:15 191:20 global 25:25 34:9 142:19 145:1,4,10 145:17 150:17 glory 192:25 Glossary 91:10 go 4:10 11:21 17:17 17:19 19:24 25:19 28:12 35:6 39:6 45:3,14 61:20 79:18 94:1 97:13 103:25 110:13 122:4,8 124:2 133:7 140:2 143:2 145:22 155:12,13 156:7 166:15	172:13 173:3,4,16 173:19 178:12 185:22 188:13 189:15 191:21 192:22 207:7 210:25 218:21 goal 203:18 goals 37:11 173:12 god 16:19 22:8,10 22:18 55:6,7 81:11 82:3 120:18 122:9,14,18,19 123:3,8 125:22 133:23 134:4 156:6,17 157:1 162:10 goes 29:11 114:25 133:14 134:22 156:10 157:21 163:6 179:14 193:23 205:7 207:11 going 4:19,21 5:4,5 7:24 8:11 13:3 18:14 24:17,21 27:14 30:25 35:3 39:19,21,22 45:24 47:18 51:25 52:13 54:6 55:15 59:22 68:7 70:2,8 71:16 74:2 77:1 87:20 89:19 92:6 94:14 97:14,25 101:16 101:18,19 103:7 103:23 106:20 107:14 108:1 110:3,22 111:6 112:8,24 113:6,20 115:15 119:15 125:5 128:8 131:9 137:25 138:4,15 138:20 141:12 145:12 150:10 151:4 158:20 162:9,11 168:22 170:25 173:22 175:3 176:19 179:24 184:5 188:6,22 193:6 199:7 212:21,24 216:8 218:15 219:19,20 gone 21:16 43:1 140:12 158:4 203:5 good 3:10,11 18:21 24:20 25:1 26:4	53:22 63:7 86:23 104:12,13 128:14 132:17 156:14 162:1,15 163:10 163:15 165:17,24 167:10 174:8 180:12 181:15 190:6 197:22 207:16 210:23 Google 12:23 Gotcha 50:13 gotten 56:8 71:19 103:20 179:9 184:19 213:10 Gould 214:9 governed 20:24 22:15 144:3 government 33:3 governs 21:14 graders 88:22 140:15 gradual 18:16 graduate 70:3,7 111:7 grained 105:3 granted 14:17 26:23 141:2 170:10 gravitation 118:17 127:21 128:9 great 7:16 126:8 163:12 167:13 219:9 greater 80:25 83:25 160:19 Greek 20:22 Greenwich 9:21 grip 133:3 ground 60:5 62:24 113:8 114:16 115:9,18 117:24 124:4 125:17 136:3 138:4 203:24 grounded 79:9 89:18 grounding 31:20 grounds 28:21 85:14 90:5 115:21 158:18 group 14:12 15:12 26:8 191:11 guess 7:6 9:5 10:12 12:2,21 29:23 36:12 47:25 51:11 70:25 71:18,21 72:17 73:18 81:13 83:9 99:15 103:23
--	---	---	--	---

129:12 130:19 151:19 152:5,10 157:18 159:20 175:2 194:15,24 211:23,23 216:3,7 guessing 106:1 guesses 62:4 Guide 151:5 guild-like 218:6 219:1 guy 78:7 82:2 91:15 216:21 guys 18:14 29:23 55:4 56:16,25 71:12 72:16,17 76:7 78:5,8 91:22 92:23,23,24 93:17 101:22 103:16,25 116:21 137:1 138:14 168:1 176:8 179:5 184:2 186:12,12 189:13 191:5 196:15 guy's 214:6	52:15 64:7 100:22 114:21 117:8 128:4,21 166:13 170:18,22 172:18 178:8 181:25,25 happy 5:16 30:12 hard 47:23 48:9 126:18 139:23 149:15 174:24 212:8,18 harder 217:2 hardly 73:24 having 3:6 25:8 26:7 28:4 35:25 59:18 61:5 70:10 73:21 74:25 75:21 87:17 91:12 104:16 128:12 145:25 146:16 174:15 209:7 217:22 hazards 144:7 head 5:15 heading 101:23 health 143:25 heard 7:22 8:16 41:1 89:21 hearing 185:3 heavy 134:8 hedge 202:6 hedged 202:4 held 81:20 help 53:2 helped 200:8 helping 202:5 helps 202:10 Henry 78:7 her 141:22 hereto 221:7 hereunto 222:13 heterodox 191:23 198:16 heterogeneous 19:3 heuristic 185:20 high 45:2 56:1 89:12 190:5 191:19 216:15,16 216:18 217:4 highest 18:1 highly 173:17 him 6:7 7:10 36:11 40:14 41:1 42:21 61:9 63:4 65:23 70:22 105:18 107:25 130:12 150:21 215:1,3,6 himself 22:7 191:4	historical 30:23 63:22 69:9 92:3 208:18 historically 12:10 13:15 66:12 89:7 120:17 154:10 177:11 209:6 218:13 history 15:7,19 17:2 17:3 19:24 30:10 31:17,19 32:17 39:9,10,18 49:17 66:9,11,24 67:2 70:9 74:20 83:10 83:12 85:18 86:21 115:4 130:19 131:19,19 140:6 160:5 164:16,18 181:13 hoc 64:11 hold 48:15,25 49:4 49:21 56:5,16 71:5 78:22 81:18 83:2,3,21,24 132:5 134:14 144:18 153:10 174:2 192:1 holding 90:5 166:11 178:6 holds 125:19 holes 109:8 home 172:19 honest 198:17 Horgan's 159:9 horrible 197:19 hour 7:3 hours 6:7 how'd 81:22 huffing 199:7 human 51:20 53:4 55:5,18 62:7,24 63:7 82:16,20 84:25 85:3,20,22 156:15 205:9,16 205:17,24 206:5,6 humanities 12:15 humans 52:5 54:9 55:6 63:9 85:23 123:11,19 human's 161:16 hundreds 33:6 hygiene 196:3,6 hypotheses 95:4 126:18 127:14 128:17 131:18 169:15 170:4,12 171:14 172:2	189:13 hypothesis 128:8 134:17 172:3 173:20 185:13 I iconic 16:6 ID 55:24 57:8 67:8 67:15 70:13 84:14 113:7,13 117:24 119:13 128:24 129:16,20 178:17 182:19 183:1 184:6,21 185:25 186:7,16,19,23 187:3 199:24 200:10 idea 9:22 20:21 22:25 26:3,4 52:2 55:5 56:22 69:4 72:10 74:11 75:5 76:3 77:19 79:17 81:10 85:10 86:9 87:24 100:18,23 101:15 114:5,20 117:6 122:13 124:21 143:20 152:7,23 162:3 163:1 167:18,20 170:11 171:11 172:20 173:25 177:12 178:23 179:1,16 184:9 187:23 190:6 202:12 215:10 ideally 14:15 ideas 15:8 16:21,23 16:25 17:6,6 86:22 93:20 139:24 156:14 165:25 174:7,7 200:22 identical 164:4 identification 23:14 94:16 97:19 142:13 151:11 192:17 identified 9:14 59:4 63:14 108:18 111:24 134:25 135:22 190:9 194:6 identify 61:7 77:11 77:16 129:3 139:12 143:18 174:3 187:15 ideology 117:16	ID's 129:19 130:15 200:16 219:8 ignored 213:7 illuminating 64:11 image 51:22 55:6 178:18 179:8 imagination 163:11 163:19 177:7 185:14 imagine 20:25 23:2 32:22 37:17 42:14 53:8,18 72:17 86:11 88:14 106:2 126:18 133:5 177:3 imagined 86:13 imagines 85:17 179:1 219:5 imagining 86:11 179:2 immunize 124:21 imperfect 25:22 implausible 159:11 implicit 101:11 implied 11:19 important 17:1,2 20:13 32:13 114:4 128:12 131:20 138:14 141:5 144:5 162:14 164:21 196:22 205:18 216:22 impose 192:10 imposing 199:3 impression 26:18 71:19 126:1 improbable 56:24 improve 103:5 improvement 38:20 103:19 improving 37:10 Innre 39:13 incentive 26:7 176:3 176:5,11 inchoate 161:19 inclined 16:10 124:7 include 65:17 71:16 71:17 110:17 155:15 161:6 175:13 included 111:15 includes 10:14 23:21 157:23 172:23 174:14 including 58:15 60:23 77:22 90:17 146:1 208:17
---	--	---	---	--

incomprehensible 172:8	information 49:8,10 50:5 51:4,10 57:18 114:1 122:24 145:7,13 145:14 173:6 206:18	intelligence 27:18 60:2,4 113:25 114:5 156:10 intelligent 9:5,9,14 10:16,19 11:3,11 27:15,24 30:9 31:2 38:11,21 40:2,14,17,23 42:12 45:20 46:5 46:25 47:4 50:9 50:10,14,20,22,24 51:8,13,25 52:3 52:20 54:17,22,24 56:7,12,18 57:15 57:25 59:3 63:17 66:8,22 67:8,18 68:5,17,21 69:5,6 69:8,11,13 70:15 70:23 71:3,6,16 71:22,23,24,25 72:4,8,10,11 73:4 73:4,8,16 74:5,16 75:1,3 76:4 81:5 83:25 84:4,9 85:8 86:10 87:9,11,21 88:20,21 89:9 90:13,19,21 91:19 92:1,7,15,24 93:1 93:6,11,15 95:21 96:11 98:12,17,23 99:6 100:9 104:15 107:18 108:18 112:12 113:24 114:11 115:12,15 115:17 116:8,11 116:15,18 118:15 119:22,24 120:3,8 120:14,15,15,23 120:24 121:5,6,9 121:10,15,17,19 121:24 122:2,11 123:17,18 124:4,7 124:20,22 125:11 125:20 126:2,4,9 130:3 131:6 136:8 138:18 139:21 140:9,11 141:21 142:1,7 146:2,7 146:13,16,19 147:5,11,11,16,17 147:25 148:3,11 148:16,18 149:4 149:18 150:2,6 151:5,5 152:1,3 152:19 153:6,14 153:21,25 154:4,8 154:20,24 158:13	158:19 159:18 161:5 162:21,24 163:5,10,12,18 164:7 168:8,21 169:4,21,22 170:14,19,21,22 170:25 171:21,22 171:25 172:13,21 173:6 176:8,15,21 177:4 180:24 182:3,7 183:6,13 188:8 189:5,8 191:14,22 192:10 193:21 194:6,11 194:13 195:7,12 195:14,17 197:11 197:13 198:11,21 200:22 207:25 211:13,21 212:3,5 212:13 214:8,13 214:18 215:15,24 intelligently 61:14 62:1,12,24 63:9 64:1 158:6 intelligents 52:5 intelligently 212:11 intelligent 75:15 intending 61:22 interact 53:19 interacted 214:15 interaction 214:19 interactions 188:15 interest 154:22 201:5 207:4 interested 15:22 21:11 24:17 45:17 70:1,25 115:6,14 182:7 184:2 222:11 interesting 60:10 62:21 88:8 89:1 91:15 112:23 125:4 176:16,20 185:18 192:20 205:20 interestingly 136:14 interests 181:12 interface 22:10 interim 149:6 internal 20:22 32:16 90:10 interpretation 89:19 interpreting 153:1 153:25 interrupting 5:3	intertwined 213:16 intimately 33:14 92:19 206:25 initially 215:12 introduced 3:12 introduces 119:4 intuitions 123:14 invent 22:18 115:23 invited 29:10,13,16 invoke 173:16 involve 112:13 115:9 127:5,6 155:21 involved 24:5 33:3 33:15 89:9 115:2 144:4,8 200:7 218:13 involvement 8:17 involves 30:22 126:4 167:4 176:22 218:23 involving 33:5 ipso 64:14 irreducible 56:21 57:9 58:2,9 59:7 87:19 88:12 99:18 106:8 137:24 139:13 167:12,12 167:18 168:4,7,25 187:10,15 irreducibly 187:6 Isaac 134:1 Islam 131:22 Islamic 190:22 issue 27:5 30:21 35:17,17 36:14 37:1,14 64:7 73:17 79:18 80:1 80:19,20 85:4 92:25 98:19,25 112:8 124:1 127:3 135:20 137:19 144:5 145:15,19 149:11 152:21 157:9 163:4 164:14 165:12,13 179:15 187:12 202:4,6 209:8 211:18 214:8 216:8 218:25 issued 97:23 issues 10:25 12:11 14:25 37:7 59:18 66:12 70:11 80:25 128:16 154:17 162:24 163:8 164:6 165:20
---------------------------	---	---	--	---

172:23,24 208:11 209:18 219:10 issuing 178:14 italicized 110:15,16 111:13,17,21 item 111:14,17,21 111:22 it'd 13:20 24:1 163:12 189:3	84:6,23 91:8 92:12 97:13 99:7 102:19,20 103:1 103:23 105:7,12 106:12 109:7 110:1 111:12,24 112:16 114:4,11 119:19 123:3,8,15 128:21 129:24 130:16,16 132:8 138:7,16,16 139:17 141:3,9,25 145:14 146:12,17 147:9,23 148:15 149:2,2 151:22 155:9 156:15 159:18,19 160:12 161:16 162:25 163:6,20 164:13 169:8,15 170:24 171:25 172:8,17 173:8 174:9,18 175:5,11 176:7 180:15 181:8 184:13 186:2,19 186:23,23 191:17 191:21 192:8 197:4,6 200:2,2 203:23 205:25 206:19 210:25 211:9 213:9,9,23 216:3,6 219:22,23 219:23	15:9,23 16:5,9,16 17:4,16 19:3 20:1 20:5 21:2,6,13,20 22:11,17,21,24 23:1,3,4,5 24:13 24:16 25:7 26:2 26:16,23 27:13 28:18 33:9,22 34:7,15,22,23 35:2,10,21,22,23 36:6,7,9,9,11,13 37:15 39:10,18 45:12,15,16,25 47:12,14 49:18 51:1,9,22 52:19 52:22 55:4,7,12 55:17,22 56:18,23 56:25 59:16,25 60:4,10 61:3,4 63:4,7,9 64:18 65:15 67:2,6,6 68:1,4,12,16,24 68:24 69:4 70:7 70:11 73:20,24 76:3,19 77:24,25 78:19 80:8 82:3,3 82:23 85:12,23,24 86:1,7,12 87:16 87:22 88:12,15 89:8,15,17,22,23 90:8,10,11 91:1 91:16,21,23 93:16 99:10 100:3,5 101:6,18 102:19 102:22 103:8,10 105:25 106:10 108:12 109:22 110:25 112:4,12 112:14,19,23 113:25 114:11,23 114:24 116:6 117:7,13,15 118:15,19,25 119:15,25 120:5 120:18,20,25 121:2,7 122:24 123:2,4,5,6,25 124:14,16,24 125:17 127:1,6,24 127:25 128:12 129:9,23,23,25 130:1 134:4 136:6 137:2,16 138:2 140:19 141:4,7,8 142:25 143:21 144:1,4,23 145:19 145:20 146:15	147:24 148:16 149:13 153:9,18 153:20 155:21 156:12,16 158:18 159:2,4,23 160:2 160:18 161:1,3 162:2,17 163:11 163:17,22 164:8 165:2 166:8,22 167:5,6,7,10,15 172:4 173:5,23 174:2,6,9 175:6 176:20 177:4 178:3,9,25 179:2 179:12,25 180:25 180:25 181:16 182:8 188:2,25 189:1,13 190:7,8 190:23 191:2 195:23 196:4 197:1 199:1,4,6 200:5,12,15 201:7 202:6,23 203:6,9 203:10,18 204:10 205:6 206:13,18 206:20 207:10 209:8,19,20 211:24 212:18 213:19,21 214:14 214:17,19,21,22 215:4,12 216:13 217:1	know 5:4,9,16 8:6 8:22 10:4,8 11:14 11:18,24 15:10,10 16:12,22,23 17:1 17:5,25 19:15,18 20:4 21:20 22:2 23:2 25:5,18,19 26:22 29:4 30:6,8 30:8 31:3,16 32:4 32:24 34:19,24 35:5 37:10 39:8 40:13,15,19,20 41:10,15,17 42:5 42:5,23 44:23 45:7 49:19 51:12 51:21 52:6,7 53:4 53:8,10,22,23 54:15,17,24 55:5 55:14,16,20 57:7 57:18 58:12,12,24 60:18 62:14 63:17 63:22 64:6,16 65:15 67:13 69:14 69:14,14,17,25 70:13 71:15,17,21 71:21 72:7 73:14 75:12,16 76:9,14 76:23 78:1,7,18 78:20,21 81:11,12 81:15,18 82:4,11 82:23 85:9,11 86:12 87:7 91:1 91:12,17,17,22 92:22,23 93:16,23 98:18,22 99:1,16 99:24,25 100:11 100:23 101:10,16 101:24 102:3,4,5 102:6,7,20 103:4 103:12,17,20,24 105:2,5,17 106:14 106:15,15 107:20 109:3,4,6,6,7,9 109:10,21 112:22 114:8,20 115:1,3 115:4 116:17,18 116:23 117:12,15 118:12 120:1,2,2 120:3,10 121:4,6 121:7 122:13,14 123:4,19 125:5,24 125:24 126:1 127:9,23 128:3,14 129:8,8,9 131:21 132:19 133:6,17 133:17,21,21,21 134:2 136:21,22
J J 214:9 job 24:24 64:12 jobs 49:20 JOEL 1:4 John 40:6 70:20 150:20,23 159:9 208:20 214:20 Johnson 84:25 85:5 129:22 214:9 Johnston's 193:18 journal 12:20 23:24 24:2 25:5,8 28:24 29:4,4 40:8 47:23 136:20 151:19 152:13,22 207:2 journals 19:15 29:10 76:2 80:14 91:10 135:18 137:17 138:21 206:17,19 Judaism 131:22 Judeo-Christian 121:13 judge 25:13 31:3 39:17 186:23 judging 25:11 131:8 133:13 136:10 judgment 28:13 JULIE 1:5 junction 102:24 June 1:13 3:2 221:4 just 4:19 5:14 7:21 9:21 13:21 14:11 15:3 16:12 17:13 20:18 24:18 25:14 26:8 28:6 29:18 31:3,21 32:12,17 34:10 37:17,21 38:23 39:19 44:20 47:18 48:22 50:25 51:6 54:13,21 56:3,9,24 57:24 58:7 60:21 62:13 64:11 67:7,16 68:21 71:4 72:22 74:21 78:17 80:10	K Kauffman 124:18 125:25 163:1 Kauffman's 125:10 keep 5:9 16:25 22:22 32:13 67:23 76:1 144:23 174:8 216:8 218:19 keeping 70:12 212:2 Ken 110:5 Keppler 179:4 kept 64:22 70:7 128:8 key 38:4,12 39:11 59:17 132:14 kids 163:11,14 165:11 179:16 kind 9:10 11:2,19 11:20 12:5,13,19			

137:7 138:12	labeling 153:1	159:10 190:17	91:7 92:18 97:2	78:24 79:3 83:6
139:19 140:2,8,12	laboratory 83:13	205:20	108:11 111:20	84:25 85:10 88:16
140:12,20,22	182:20,24 183:8,9	leading 9:5 126:23	120:10 121:6	90:11 91:1,3 93:6
143:24 144:11,13	183:12,15,17	136:19	137:5 140:4	101:4,22 102:14
145:1,1,6,20	laces 134:9	leads 33:20 65:15	142:12 151:10	103:21 107:6
146:25 147:12	lack 145:11 213:13	176:23 212:15	168:3,3 173:5	108:22 109:5
148:13,14,19	LaFollette 70:5	leap 87:16	178:12 181:17	112:8 114:23
149:8,8,13,15,17	laid 60:10	learn 163:14 179:25	182:6,23 203:2	116:3,19 118:16
149:25 150:3,5,7	Lakatos 39:13	learning 17:19	210:20,25	119:22 123:4,15
156:24,25 162:8	Lamarck 18:9	208:6,14 214:17	level 23:3 57:16	124:6,18 125:6,23
162:10 163:12,20	Lamarckianism	least 19:18 20:19	99:11 112:10	126:1,1,7 127:4
165:10,20 166:8	205:3	24:19 26:19 29:13	114:8 136:16	127:24 129:13,14
166:25 167:1,16	Lamarck's 152:7,24	31:4 57:3 58:25	156:21 159:21	129:22,24 131:2,4
168:23 170:2,3	large 14:1 33:4,5	62:2 68:6 80:12	174:1 184:19	134:1 136:7,8
172:3,5,10,12,15	51:3 165:13	90:11 112:5	216:15,16,19	137:1,6 140:25
173:7,7 174:25	196:25 217:25	118:22 130:24	217:2,4,5,11	142:11 144:10,15
175:10 176:2,15	218:24	136:15 137:5	levels 18:1 112:11	145:19 148:10
176:19 177:13,15	largely 19:9 33:10	142:4 143:21	liberal 192:7	150:4 158:11
177:20,20 178:5	52:11 70:21	199:8	library 49:9 50:5	159:22 160:1
179:7 181:1,13	107:22 113:20	leave 17:6 181:19	LIEB 1:4	162:10 163:1,15
182:9 183:6,22	149:7 160:11	leaves 185:10	life 20:23 21:13 23:7	165:21,22 167:12
184:4 185:12,13	175:24 181:3	led 32:8 33:4 45:24	25:18 51:1,6,9	173:5,11 174:3
186:2,13 189:12	203:4,5	45:25 86:16 121:4	52:1,24 53:6,10	177:14,21 178:24
189:15,17,21	larger 24:18 30:23	145:5 149:23,24	53:12 54:12 56:13	179:3,4,21 181:6
190:7,8,17,18,20	66:12 80:11 90:24	left 20:15	56:21 57:2 60:22	181:15,16 184:1
191:4,5,11,16,17	198:22 200:13	legal 209:7	61:14 62:1,7,11	184:11 191:4
192:5 193:6 194:8	215:11	legally 200:17	63:12 74:12 80:16	196:14 198:14,24
194:24 196:1,2,6	Larry 69:16,17	legitimacy 14:2	81:1,14 82:22	199:3,5 200:23
196:7,23 197:2,2	208:25,25	186:23	86:13 89:2,7,18	202:22 203:14,20
197:8 199:6,19	last 6:6 15:4 39:12	legs 190:16 191:3,21	90:25 101:25	205:3,21,25
200:2,14 202:1,8	48:2 91:15 150:11	lend 22:24	109:16 114:9,10	207:13 210:21
202:21 203:7,7,9	150:11 157:18	length 7:16	114:16 115:6,13	212:23 213:8
204:18 205:19,21	178:12 185:23	lengthy 219:20	115:14 123:18,23	218:4
206:7,17 209:13	lasts 130:23	lenient 140:9	125:14,17 140:7	likeness 55:6
210:8 212:9,9,23	late 22:3 47:6 85:19	less 32:25 38:11	140:25 155:15	likewise 33:16
213:3,3,17 214:9	114:22 208:19	105:5 110:5 149:7	156:18 157:24,24	limit 117:18
214:20,23 215:3,3	later 47:14 103:1	149:8 163:25	158:6 160:10,15	limited 22:15
215:19 218:14	110:24 184:6	206:22 218:4	161:18 162:21	101:17
knowing 30:22	191:11 202:4	let 3:12 4:20 5:6,9	163:2 164:17	limits 122:14
137:2	latest 64:15	5:15 6:24 19:23	168:13 177:20	line 19:3 81:3 94:23
knowledge 10:16	latter 21:16 65:8	23:11 28:6,6	202:24 209:4	149:23 185:7
11:3 12:9 13:6,8,9	Laudan 69:17,17	50:22,22 56:3	lifespan 38:15	197:10 206:11
13:22 14:1,7,24	208:25 209:1	74:9,9 83:3 84:3,6	light 66:22 90:2	lineage 69:9 83:11
16:9 17:3 20:1	launch 138:12	84:24 92:12 97:13	105:1 173:2	lines 32:20 107:15
25:23 42:15 46:2	152:22	111:12 120:7	216:23	116:19 137:23
52:9,11 178:13,18	Lavoisier 47:6	133:3 135:13	like 3:20 9:10,21	linkages 205:13
179:23 180:6,10	law 1:23 3:13 7:7	156:17 161:16,20	12:11,25 152:11	Linnaeus 81:19
180:11,13,23	8:14 21:5 29:21	172:12 182:12	15:19 16:16 17:12	82:2
218:20 221:5	laws 20:22,24 21:15	194:1 195:2	17:22 18:12,18	list 23:10,24
known 9:15 70:20	22:9,15,25 47:11	202:15 211:14,18	19:16,25 20:10,12	listed 107:10
126:10 145:14	95:3 96:20 167:1	219:13	22:4 23:4 26:14	listen 49:11
146:23 206:11	lawsuit 3:15 165:16	letigimacy 186:16	31:2,23,24 34:6,8	lists 150:13
knows 27:11 193:4	lawyers 4:9	letters 212:10	34:17 35:22 36:10	literal 123:21
Kuhn 215:13	lay 52:15	let's 14:24 15:8 29:2	40:16 44:13 47:11	literalism 89:14
	laying 61:7 65:25	34:18 35:9 43:9	48:7 51:4,9,10	153:17
	162:4 209:16	44:22 53:18 54:21	53:12,25 54:22,22	literalist 67:14 68:4
	lead 54:9 116:23	55:12 56:3 70:19	63:11 65:14 66:25	68:14

literally 40:16 113:16 literature 104:1 126:17 212:6,8 213:8 litigating 17:19 litigation 4:7 little 4:19 13:21 17:13 25:16 26:6 28:23 29:12 33:7 35:3 36:11 45:6 77:4 99:25 100:18 110:25 111:9 125:2 133:4 139:6 152:11 163:8 164:5 190:20 live 35:10 lives 160:7 living 33:16 54:3 56:13 Lloyd 1:15 LLP 1:19 3:14 loads 34:12 located 9:6 114:11 130:9 191:4 206:19 LOCATION 1:15 locked 22:22 Logan 1:20 London 15:20 long 35:6 38:9 70:20 96:18 113:3 128:7 130:23 134:13 140:12 171:13 longer 35:10 163:22 long-term 164:20 look 6:9,10 10:25 15:7 19:25 20:12 22:13 24:14,16 28:19 31:23 32:18 32:18 33:16 37:22 38:25 39:17,21 45:3,24,25 52:13 57:19 62:3,4 64:6 66:16,20 67:2 74:22 76:6,15 79:15 82:12 86:21 88:13 90:4 94:20 102:7,10,13 103:3 111:2 119:19 121:5,23 124:19 127:20 131:16 132:12 133:21,25 136:8 138:5 141:16,17 149:4 149:22 178:23 188:20 191:1	196:14 201:22 203:2,7 204:24 205:15,15 206:19 207:4 219:13 looked 6:11 45:6 66:9,21 looking 17:23 22:8 24:19 27:18 38:13 38:17,23 45:10 59:3 64:23 73:4 88:1 109:20 118:13,16 159:22 172:25 178:5 179:11 186:3 206:16 looks 17:12 78:23 192:20 212:17 loose 60:20 looser 58:18 lose 177:1 lot 9:8 18:5 26:20 29:9,9 30:14 32:12 34:10 35:8 39:22 43:12 48:14 55:3 56:19 57:21 61:1 62:7 63:3 66:4,14,20 89:7 89:23 101:23 102:12 114:16 126:24 128:16 155:3,9 162:6,24 168:24 180:22 181:2 189:10,23 200:7 212:17 216:12 220:3 lots 25:9 35:6 66:23 96:19 99:2,2 167:5 174:10 175:25 196:4 loudly 134:12 lower 23:3 loyal 182:9 lunch 86:24 104:5 lurking 93:20 lying 62:23 L-a-k-a-t-o-s 39:13	107:18 118:21 119:16 125:3 129:7 148:3 158:14 159:23 160:1 163:5 170:2 179:18 196:5 206:14 212:2 214:15 magazines 45:2 212:12 main 13:25 36:13,13 43:9,16,17 57:17 78:5,18 91:10 144:21 159:19 206:18,19 216:7 mainstream 146:3 158:14 179:6,12 maintain 88:3 188:17 maintained 60:1,16 173:21 maintaining 188:11 maintains 99:17 major 39:22 178:14 194:13 213:10,11 217:12 218:10 majority 28:3 make 4:23 5:5 22:12 24:4 25:20 29:8 31:6 36:13 37:18 38:11 48:22 52:17 57:24 58:7 71:21 72:1 74:15 78:19 87:25 97:16 105:8 107:7,24 108:2,22 118:20 122:2 128:1 129:23 131:13 135:24 158:4 160:19 169:8 170:13,21 172:8,12 206:20 207:3 209:5 210:10 213:19 217:5 makes 15:16 26:5 32:4,4,5,5 35:18 57:5 59:18 64:10 75:12 91:19 114:24 131:25 132:20 134:4 141:4 154:11 158:9 175:10 195:12 200:24 204:23 214:13,17 making 31:23 37:12 38:16 39:1 55:15 69:23 88:11 90:4	101:5,6 104:17 110:1 120:12 124:10 137:11 139:16 142:6 144:9 145:14 147:9 150:2 169:20 181:11 183:5 186:22 194:13 201:2 204:21,25 205:17 malign 198:8 man 215:6 manage 21:18 managed 21:8,9 107:8 122:1 Management 25:23 manifest 54:6 manner 17:11 86:1 88:10 91:21 104:4 manufacturing 205:18 many 6:7 40:13 41:1 41:1 54:25 74:1 80:10 92:23 112:11 121:8 131:22 132:22 160:5 172:6 179:22 180:14,15 181:12 182:1 198:25 206:20 213:6 map 74:25 75:10 131:24 Marcel 70:5 march 218:5 marginalized 66:25 90:24 margins 125:6 mark 23:11 94:14 97:17 142:11 151:4,10 marked 23:14,17 87:14 94:16 97:19 97:22 142:13,16 151:11 192:17 marker 147:10 markers 166:10 market 33:22,23 34:3,16 marketed 33:25 marriage 222:10 massive 21:19 master's 10:23 208:4 215:19 matched 164:8,9 material 117:9 119:20 128:4	177:12 212:21 materialism 194:15 199:4 materialist 193:24 materially 52:17 materials 27:19 45:13 211:1,4,12 212:1 mathematical 11:6 16:3 55:2 59:21 64:19,25 65:20 85:14 87:14 99:12 127:25 mathematically 60:5,12 63:8 85:13 114:20 125:15 134:5 mathematician 115:3 183:10 213:18 mathematicians 183:11 212:4 mathematics 11:7,8 11:16,19,20 18:1 49:13 216:11 matter 3:17 11:23 47:8 50:6 82:4,12 94:15 117:15 120:21 121:3 128:21 153:15 174:2 219:3 222:12 matters 12:18 70:1 114:9 145:25 159:25 195:19 199:25 216:9 maximally 166:23 may 5:16 8:24 9:11 29:8,16 41:16 69:17 70:19,22 72:16,17 75:4,25 77:18 79:20 84:24 97:17 103:9,20 130:11 150:9,20 150:21 152:8,24 164:25 190:20 195:18 196:17 197:20 212:9 maybe 6:8,8,16 7:14 41:6 53:2 58:16 68:7 70:3,22 71:1 71:18 84:7 93:19 97:15 102:9 110:21 112:16 130:9,10 143:22 150:6 159:8 161:22 163:16
--	--	---	---	---

165:19 172:24 175:25 197:8 199:8,23 202:22 206:24 210:14 mean 13:10,11,11 13:14 14:8,22 15:3,4,7 16:12,14 21:12 23:25 24:12 24:13 27:16 28:14 30:5,13 31:3 32:21 34:6 35:4 35:18 36:13,19 38:1,13 39:11 40:15,16 42:7 45:7,7,7 46:15 47:15,22 50:21 51:15,19,21,21 52:6 54:7,15 55:16 56:1,3,8,10 56:19,20 57:3,17 58:7,12,16,16,18 58:19 59:17 62:2 62:3,5,20 64:12 65:8,8,12,13 66:2 66:9,14,19 67:5 67:10,11,17,22 69:3,4,6,10 70:20 71:15,15 72:20,23 73:7,11,15,16,19 73:23 74:10 75:12 75:14,17 76:24 77:20,20,21,21 78:5,6,23 79:2 80:9,12 81:9,19 81:21 82:2,11,15 82:18 83:9 84:1,6 85:1,9 86:17 87:21,21 88:7,16 89:16 90:2,11 91:14 92:12 93:8 93:14,18,20,22 94:11 95:10,25 99:21 100:21 101:4,24 102:12 102:13,13 103:15 103:23 105:1,4,11 105:12,24 106:15 106:24 107:5 108:1,4,11,22,24 109:14,19 110:7 110:18 111:8,10 112:2,2,2,5 113:10,17,23 114:12,13,18,18 115:4 116:16 117:4,14,23 118:5 118:7,9 119:16	120:5,8,9,17 121:4,22 122:6 123:8,25 124:6,11 125:22 126:22,23 127:2,22 128:14 129:24 130:2,2,17 130:18,24 131:12 133:2 135:9,13 136:4 138:7,13 139:6,11,15,16 140:1,2,7 145:7,9 145:10,10 146:11 146:11,18,22 147:1,2,14,23 148:2 149:2,12,14 149:15,24 150:5,8 150:18,21 152:10 153:8,12,25 154:3 154:7,9,12,13,21 155:2,8,9,20,20 156:12 157:18 158:12,17 159:6,8 159:9,20 160:4,22 161:4,21 163:12 163:15,17,25 164:6,23 165:16 165:17 166:5,6,12 166:19 167:8,12 169:10 170:17 171:4,10,24 172:1 172:8,12 174:20 175:6 176:25 177:2,3,19 178:23 183:10,12 184:9 185:1,20 186:1,7 186:13 187:5,7,8 187:12 188:1,7,7 188:12 189:3,4,11 190:5,23 191:2,9 191:25 192:8 194:21,24 196:1,1 196:16 197:1 198:13,17 199:25 200:3,14,19,20 202:3,6,15,20 203:24,25 204:19 205:15,16,17,23 206:11,13 208:5 209:13,19 212:8 212:20 213:3,9,9 213:23,24 214:10 214:19 215:2 216:6,17,20 217:10 218:7,8,8 Meaning 71:6 meaningful 87:6 181:11	means 15:1 19:7 22:24 28:2 32:16 34:14,16 37:20 63:8 66:3 89:3 127:7 138:7 170:24 171:2 192:1 214:22 222:7,7 meant 15:4 51:19 55:1 59:16 60:4,5 70:15 88:12 209:12,20 measures 180:21 mecca 9:11 mechanical 156:9 mechanics 118:18 118:20 166:25 203:20 mediated 177:17 178:7 meet 6:2,7 184:25 meetings 214:23 members 8:24 memory 7:11 Mendel 196:10,14 Mendelian 196:2,5 196:7 197:3,6 mention 35:24 mentioned 28:22 77:6 157:20 178:24 mentioning 212:9 menu 107:7 mere 108:23 merit 83:22,23,25 84:2,5 198:12 201:23 merits 28:19 133:13 messy 34:17 met 215:6 metaphore 178:13 metaphysical 15:9 15:25 18:25 19:9 19:12,21 21:22 22:6,12 37:7,17 46:10 59:20 60:11 64:19 118:3 119:5 119:6 161:1 173:18,20 174:5 174:10,13 175:8 metaphysically 16:10,13 metaphysics 15:14 15:17 16:7,13 17:8 18:15 21:25 37:13 46:3 64:24 118:25 150:2	173:24 174:1,1,9 175:5 176:13 181:18 metatheory 173:6 method 65:4,6,10 76:16,23 77:4,5 107:22 171:12 methodological 116:4 117:3,19 118:6,9,19,24 119:2,6 122:6 132:14 174:24 175:4,7,8,10,23 176:4 215:4 methodologically 15:17 37:7 132:2 methodology 15:2,6 76:25 80:16 174:6 methods 16:24 76:14 78:21 182:21 183:19 Meyer 35:25,25 36:9 39:12,24 40:2,7,9,10 57:17 92:9 105:13 150:24 152:9,18 153:2 166:15 167:6,7 173:5 Meyer's 6:16,20,20 35:12,12 92:19 156:4,8 159:15 Michael 36:4 69:18 91:14 124:12 152:9 193:19 209:1 212:23 Michigan 1:16,24 3:1 221:16 222:2 222:4,17 micro-Playdough 103:6 middle 1:2 60:4 140:5 might 16:8 19:4 22:5,25 29:18 37:6 39:14 44:2 47:9,10 49:11 56:19 60:14,22,24 62:5,16,22 63:9 65:21 66:15 69:24 74:17 75:22 86:17 89:9 103:1 107:6 113:25 122:13 124:22 126:2,2 128:23 129:8,10 133:9 139:25 140:12,25 142:25 166:24 170:4	190:13 196:19,25 214:14,17 216:11 migrates 159:7 migration 86:2 Miller 110:5,19 111:10 113:7 115:24 185:24 millions 177:21 mind 5:10 22:8 32:13 42:25 64:22 67:24 72:5,7 94:10 109:24 122:14,18,19 134:16 162:12 205:5 218:19 minded 73:18 mindless 56:24 mindset 158:1 159:4 162:7 181:16 mine 215:13 minimize 23:6 minor 112:2 minority 28:1 minute 38:23 41:7 103:17 207:14 211:14 minutes 52:22 192:22 misleading 113:15 misleadingly 198:19 miss 35:23 missed 193:6 mistake 197:11 misunderstanding 36:6 misusing 69:20 MIT 70:6 mobilized 75:7 187:6 mod 77:10 model 22:4 51:19 52:23 53:6 54:9 65:25 81:13 123:1 156:17 157:1,24 158:6 188:14 modeling 124:15 160:12 161:17 models 35:8 54:18 101:20 109:2 160:6 modern 22:21 67:18 72:25 77:11 81:20 83:15 143:20 162:19 modes 183:23 184:3 molecular 34:12 48:18 137:14,18
---	---	---	--	---

138:22	196:25 197:7	121:3,14 123:15	16:5 17:22 18:19	68:13 75:3 87:8
moment 17:2 19:4	199:1,6,6 212:7	126:7 136:4	20:8 21:7 22:22	97:23 99:4,22
34:15 38:13 39:20	213:13,20,22,25	137:20,25 139:24	23:3 32:25 33:2	108:13 114:11
39:20 84:8 85:9	214:15,18 216:17	148:23 155:2,10	48:6 50:16 51:24	120:17 136:11
86:12 103:24	217:1 219:12,13	157:20,21 158:14	56:24 79:22,22	145:15 154:16
120:2 151:22	morning 3:10,11 6:6	159:2 162:14	80:11 83:10,12	158:19 180:11
163:20 170:25	35:11 104:14	174:4 178:2 180:9	90:23 91:20 95:3	192:6 197:25
179:23 181:24	morphological	181:13 190:14	103:20 106:9	206:12 209:24
189:12 211:15	74:22 77:7	192:7,13 193:2	125:13,18,23	necessary 17:18
momentum 33:13	most 12:21 20:16	197:12 199:19	126:11 127:1	31:14 60:2 74:3
monarch 143:16	21:15 27:4 29:24	201:18 203:12	163:3 168:14	95:17 114:7
144:11,12,14	55:24 70:10,13	204:16 214:18	169:1 170:12	117:14 125:16
money 34:10,13	71:24 109:20	216:16 220:2	172:2,6 174:20	162:7 189:9
monitor 212:6,8	137:22 166:23	multi 23:24	175:20 187:25	206:15
monitored 27:3	168:12 175:25	multiple 85:21	203:1,16 204:12	need 5:14 15:18
monolithic 143:22	176:12 177:23	86:13,15	206:7 215:22,25	31:16,18,20 75:4
144:23 199:2	183:16 204:9,9,10	must 173:19	216:4	76:25 109:4
monopoly 197:3	204:11 206:4,9,24	mutation 79:22	naturalism 116:4	114:17 120:4
monotheistic 120:18	217:21	80:11 172:2	117:3,19 118:3,6	121:19 122:18
more 1:23 7:7 8:14	mostly 27:9	204:13 206:7	118:8,10,15,19,24	137:23 138:6
14:11,13 15:13	motion 20:2,3,4,7,7	mutations 168:14	119:5,6,7,7,13	165:4 180:20
16:10,11,11 19:2	128:4 177:13	mutually 93:1	165:8 174:16	189:16,25 194:24
20:24 29:12,20	motivate 89:6	186:11,15	175:8,9,11,23	203:8 204:3 206:3
30:1,11,12,19	motivated 86:5	mutation 203:16	176:4,7,14,23	208:21 210:8,22
34:5 35:17 37:19	131:23 154:22	myself 3:12 5:17	177:6,10 178:2,2	211:4 219:23
37:20 38:16 39:1	190:13	25:22 48:25 49:12	178:9 217:22	needs 17:25 36:14
45:6 46:1,10 54:4	motivating 128:13	81:18 83:2 119:4	218:4	64:22 65:6 100:7
54:4 63:6,11	164:22 181:20	192:19	naturalism/super...	125:8 145:16
64:10 66:22 67:6	motivation 131:17	mysterious 128:3	119:17	163:4 165:7
68:11 73:20 76:7	134:21 143:4	M.D 1:8	naturalist 174:22	167:25 199:7
78:10 82:12 83:13	154:7,8,15		175:4	negative 173:21
86:10 88:6 90:22	motivations 154:13	N	naturalistic 34:6,6	negatively 198:2
91:3 96:23 97:1,8	181:22 195:18	N 2:3	117:7 120:13	negotiation 29:14
100:5 101:13,14	200:20	naïl 148:11	164:23 174:22	neither 138:24
101:18 102:18	motive 161:11	nailed 61:5	185:4,13,15,17	160:23
103:8 104:2,17,23	motives 131:11	naïve 199:9	naturalistically	Neo-Darwinian
105:2,17 107:18	198:8	name 3:13 12:20	164:25	83:9,15 93:10
110:25 112:14	move 18:15 19:23	26:13	naturalists 119:18	140:3
113:9 117:1	59:17,20 108:8	named 78:7	174:24	Neo-Darwinism
119:25 120:5	114:23 179:18	namely 14:9 37:3,6	naturalized 128:9	83:5 113:13 114:7
121:14 124:6,10	218:16	75:20 76:6 78:11	164:20	189:20 190:8
124:25 125:4	moved 16:10 139:24	88:9 101:6 109:1	nature 14:7 17:15	neutral 134:23
130:13 136:4	148:16	116:2 140:17	20:24 23:1,7	135:5,15
144:5,5,6,6,10	movement 9:9 30:9	156:14 167:14	30:18 31:9 50:12	neutralize 198:14
145:19,25,25	34:9 71:23 86:10	169:23 179:11	52:1 59:19 69:5	never 4:3 8:16 25:1
147:5 148:9,24	87:22 93:15 130:4	names 113:5	72:19 79:19 89:2	71:19 92:13
149:6,8 156:5	148:13 197:12	narrowly 78:8	89:7,9,18 90:25	130:18,19 149:12
158:14,15,16,16	198:22	NAS 201:11,19	93:3 109:25 114:9	150:3 170:25
158:21,23 159:3,3	moves 132:9	202:2	114:9,15 115:6,12	171:7 215:6,6
159:6,6,6,24	moving 46:6 54:20	nation 143:17	115:14 117:8	nevertheless 78:16
160:14,14,16,17	much 15:9 19:2	144:10	125:14 128:11	127:8
160:19,20 163:25	20:12 22:21 34:22	National 94:24 96:8	157:24 175:3	nevertheless 21:7
165:18 170:21,23	39:13 44:21 51:4	96:22,23 97:7,11	178:7 218:11	new 14:20 112:7,13
178:6,7 179:21	63:6 85:10 89:18	144:15,22 207:9	Nazi 196:2 198:4	136:6 141:7
182:7 185:2	92:2 97:8 100:5	native 17:23 34:11	Nazis 197:3,17,25	212:25
187:10,12 192:7	101:18 105:2	natural 10:9,11,13	near 207:14	newcomers 31:2
192:13 194:24	117:1 118:20	11:4,9,20 15:22	necessarily 31:12	news 64:16 133:19

newspapers 212:12	notifications 11:17	115:9 116:23	43:18,21 44:10,14	198:1,10,15,25
Newton 20:10 22:5	notion 43:14 57:8	146:11 152:1	46:7,14,17,25	199:17,17 202:14
22:7,7,13,14 23:7	64:19 85:12 105:2	168:12,23 205:23	47:17 48:4,9	206:22 207:17
127:24 128:2,5	112:14 126:20	occur 127:22,23	49:24 50:11,13,19	208:9 210:15,20
134:1 179:2,2,10	147:12 172:8	128:12	53:18,22 54:2,19	210:23 211:7
Newtonian 23:6	181:7	occur 17:15	56:3,11,17 57:2,7	212:1,20 214:6
118:17 166:24	notions 14:18 15:9	occurred 80:6	58:2,7,14 59:3,8	215:18,21 217:7
203:20	26:23 56:25 60:11	161:18	59:10,12 61:19,24	218:21 219:4
Newtonianism	116:5 118:23	occurrence 107:10	62:10,15,17,22	220:1
22:20	121:11 128:11	occurs 112:4 122:16	63:1 65:22 68:15	old 18:22 55:3,4
Newton's 127:20	187:6	off 3:12 5:8 85:11	69:2,2,10,13 71:2	71:8,13 72:6,20
167:3	notwithstanding	89:8 107:14	72:1,7,10,23 73:3	82:1 89:22 102:21
next 27:1 40:11	156:3	117:16 118:13,14	73:11,13 74:4	131:14 184:13
145:22 151:10	nowadays 33:6	118:16 119:1	75:17 77:10 79:17	omitting 165:3
173:16 190:6	nuance 112:14	125:17 148:16	79:21 80:21,24	once 40:3 45:4
204:20 216:20	nuclear 33:11	164:24 171:1,16	81:3 82:18 83:1	64:25 86:22
217:6	number 9:16 92:23	178:25 193:3	83:17,21,24 84:10	102:14 132:9
niche 33:25	168:23 213:4	196:24 199:10,15	87:8 88:19,24	166:7 181:25
night 6:6	numbers 215:11	220:1	89:24 94:9 95:13	200:6 211:3
Nilsen 141:20		offer 7:25	95:18 96:8,11,16	one 4:23 8:6 11:1
ninth 88:22 140:15	O	offering 182:9	97:5 98:3,10,14	17:25 18:10 19:22
nobody 92:14 139:9	object 68:23 71:9	offers 187:3 206:16	98:17,22 100:8,14	22:19 25:22 26:4
nodding 5:12	74:7 81:24 82:9	official 24:12,13	101:7 103:12	26:25 30:22 31:1
nonblasphemous	82:19 92:10,17	often 4:24 13:17	104:20 105:7	32:12 33:1 34:18
156:6	96:3 108:6 121:1	14:18 15:1 16:5	106:20 107:3	37:5,15,23 38:19
none 102:9 218:10	121:21 123:20	21:19 24:5,21	109:23 110:3,21	39:11,20 40:8
non-evolutionary	126:12 135:8,19	25:5 45:1 124:16	111:12,20 115:17	42:25 43:12,25
66:17	139:2 140:16	138:18 175:21	115:21 117:3,17	47:24 48:3 49:18
non-human 54:10	146:8 147:21	181:20 213:16,19	117:23 118:2	54:15 55:11,23
non-natural 54:10	148:22 153:7,23	213:23	120:22 122:16	59:23,24 60:6,8
non-question 35:21	154:6 155:7,17	oh 5:1,1 6:8 7:13 8:9	123:8,25 124:23	61:10 62:5 67:12
non-science 17:10	169:12 171:9,11	9:23 13:19 23:13	126:16 127:11,21	68:17 70:22 71:4
35:21 36:18 37:16	177:24,25 180:7	29:8 40:22 47:6	128:24 129:3,16	73:5 74:18,19,21
37:24	182:5 194:20	73:2 94:18 113:3	131:12 132:9	74:21 76:16 77:24
non-scientific 19:5	195:15	128:21 138:16	133:19 136:24,25	78:5 79:5,8,18,18
normal 10:4 27:4	objecting 104:4	167:9 193:4,17	137:16,19 138:24	79:21,22 80:21
109:19 119:20	180:3	198:2 202:22	139:5,7 140:6,7	81:15 85:16,17
135:21 138:3,8	objection 30:14	214:2	141:15,17,19	86:12,12,13,17,21
160:17	36:13 39:3 61:16	okay 3:20 4:17 5:9	142:6,11,22 143:2	88:1,11 89:16
normally 14:3 29:11	61:20 67:19	5:17 6:2,7,14,18	143:7,10,20	93:10 94:2 97:16
32:24 65:16 91:13	100:10 103:5	6:20 7:3,7,13,19	144:13,19 145:10	101:21 102:13,16
93:7 100:4 116:14	108:21 129:5	8:1,7,13,17,20,23	146:24,25 147:16	103:4,10 107:10
118:23 120:13	147:7 156:19	9:1,20,23 10:2,13	147:20 149:1,8,10	110:18 111:14,14
122:5 144:4	176:24	10:16,19,22 11:3	150:5,16,23 151:2	114:25 115:13
188:18	objections 37:18	11:14 12:3,6,7	151:25 152:17,23	116:24 117:23,24
normative 12:8,14	objective 131:5	13:5 16:14 17:17	153:5,19 154:3,20	118:9 120:21
13:5,7,10	133:11 141:25	17:20 18:14 19:19	154:24 157:3,18	121:23 122:12,17
notables 9:9	142:9 194:18	19:23 20:6,16,20	161:20 162:23	127:15 131:14
Notarial 222:13	195:13	21:15 23:13,23	164:12 166:20,20	133:5 134:25
Notary 3:6 221:15	objects 128:5	24:3,7 25:7 27:21	168:12,23 170:6,6	140:25 144:25
222:1,4,17	observations 98:5	28:14 29:10,20	170:10 173:23,25	145:16 147:13
note 131:18	observe 202:15	30:16,19 31:8	174:18 175:20	149:3 150:14,16
notes 84:13	observer 214:22	32:20 33:15 34:11	177:1 178:23	150:18,19,21
nothing 4:10 40:9	obvious 14:9	36:16 38:7,8,17	181:25 186:5	156:4,4,21 157:23
82:7,11 154:14	obviously 5:2 27:18	40:1,20 41:8,13	192:19,19 193:8	158:10 159:20
173:7 176:9	51:7,12,20 73:22	41:16,21 42:3,6,9	193:13,23 194:18	160:22 167:16,21
187:10 222:6	93:11 114:6,15	42:12,16 43:2,15	195:9,20,25 196:3	169:15 170:4,13

171:22 172:2,3 174:13,18,24 179:3,6 180:8 184:1,14 185:12 185:13 186:9 189:5,5,5 190:4 190:10 191:18 194:14 197:2 199:7 200:11 202:7 208:22 209:3 212:17 214:12 218:3 219:13 ones 57:11,17 60:12 63:11 86:13 186:13 oneself 158:1 only 8:8 12:9 17:2 35:11 40:3 57:19 90:15 97:10 99:16 100:3 101:21 106:1 107:16 108:17 109:16 112:3 130:25 133:6 154:21 167:16 168:1,2 173:1 186:13 189:13,15,17 190:14 191:10 204:22 onto 166:15 193:23 onward 90:23 on-board 7:15 8:10 40:7 158:16 on-line 211:22 open 21:21 24:1 45:13 73:14,18 102:22 103:22 107:21 134:2 136:12 140:23 141:4 145:12,25 145:25 171:13 185:10 208:2,5 216:13 218:19 219:18 opened 124:24 171:25 opening 34:3 150:13 150:18,20 181:1 185:18 openly 126:13 openness 141:4 opens 33:22 185:7 185:17 open-minded 12:1 124:10 open-mindedness	140:20 operate 59:24 78:14 79:16 119:20 123:5 169:1 operates 107:23 161:25 operating 12:16 34:16 87:23 104:3 114:8 155:24 159:1 opinion 88:21 89:11 110:5 143:22 opinions 145:17 opponent 39:13 opponents 171:16 opportunity 193:7 opposed 115:13 opposing 100:20 opposite 82:24 166:11 opposite's 128:6 opposition 182:9 oppositionally 14:19 optimistic 198:19 order 6:12 16:23 17:5 19:17 51:10 51:16,18 69:5 117:6 118:11 122:9 125:16 181:15 187:16,17 188:3 193:15 196:11 206:8,8 orders 60:1 ordinary 5:2 organic 20:4 47:13 121:7 organism 20:25 23:1 74:21 75:9,9 organisms 21:18 23:3 74:22,25 75:25 organization 15:21 organize 78:1,19 organized 10:7 12:12 14:1 orientation 113:10 orientations 115:8 192:8 oriented 34:7 54:20 212:11 213:19 origin 85:22 86:13 140:3 original 152:13 originally 40:8 90:1 107:6 127:22 151:18 166:9	214:6 originated 15:8 107:3,5 origins 51:1 60:22 85:20,21 86:15 115:5 209:23 orthodoxy 192:11 ostrich 218:4 other 4:15,25 5:3 6:10,14 8:6 20:2 23:5 27:4 29:17 30:10 32:16,21 33:21,24 35:5,7 38:10 40:6 44:10 44:12,18 50:16 57:13,14 59:24 62:18 65:18 66:5 68:10 73:6 82:22 88:11 92:12 100:24 101:2,10 101:14 102:21 106:7 109:3 111:24 114:10 116:18,18,25 118:14 119:21,25 121:25 132:17 143:23 148:18 151:14 156:5 159:10,13 167:3,9 168:9 170:4 172:3 172:3,14 173:2 174:12,18 176:5 179:11 182:22 183:14,20,25 184:4,21,21 187:3 192:6,13 202:11 202:25,25 203:9 203:15 204:19 205:20 207:24,24 209:15,25 210:13 211:9,12,17,18 212:7 216:5 218:14 others 6:19 35:22 36:8 78:16 163:1 192:7 212:7 otherwise 100:5 138:16 141:2 176:10 197:21 ought 13:11 140:1,9 ourselves 17:5 25:4 52:12 156:25 out 7:23 15:15 18:14,25 20:11 21:5 25:10 28:10 35:18 37:9 44:25 47:9 48:15,25	49:4,21 52:15 56:5 59:20 60:10 61:7 62:14 65:25 70:6 71:22 73:9 74:14 75:10 78:23 79:18 82:7,10 84:9 86:18,20 89:20 90:6,7 91:18 103:16 104:20,21 112:9 119:21 128:7 136:13 144:2 147:1 149:6 150:8 150:16 158:13 162:9 164:23 168:9 172:22,25 174:11 175:12 185:14 186:9 189:4,6,10 190:1 202:4 205:9 206:21 209:16 212:17,25 215:10 216:21 218:12,13 outcome 19:8 outcomes 53:17 outlet 136:25 outlook 14:20 outright 29:15,19 outset 27:5 30:5 outside 80:20 176:12 180:2 191:4 over 14:9 15:11 37:18 38:15 46:9 68:2 70:12 74:18 85:19 87:14 91:15 101:5 103:19 121:7 132:4 143:22 157:16,17 165:21 173:10 189:2 overall 78:3 173:12 overlap 57:22 overlapping 56:19 113:18 114:15 164:3 overplay 185:25,25 overplaying 165:23 overtake 194:15 over-arching 21:17 own 24:25 26:13 31:21 35:24 37:11 44:19 50:7,7 70:9 78:14 83:11 84:11 85:22 122:4 137:24 138:12,20 138:20 148:17	156:4 160:17 172:19 173:3 176:17 187:1 199:8,9 203:5 P Pa 1:8 pad 152:22 page 2:5 23:10,23 23:24 55:23 72:1 84:21 94:2,3,20 97:13 98:3 110:4 110:15 143:2,3 145:22,22 150:11 150:11 152:6 156:2 166:1 173:16,16 182:18 185:23 186:6 193:14,15 199:21 201:9 204:20 217:19 pages 45:8 134:9 paid 7:1 24:24 paleontologist 80:24 paleontology 48:20 48:25 49:1 58:20 58:24 59:6 80:21 83:12 Paley 21:23 22:11 51:21 55:3 68:12 85:12 87:15 123:15 Paley's 91:2 paradigm 52:19 108:12 166:24 179:25 180:11 paragraph 94:21,23 110:4,16 111:14 111:17,22 112:6 112:15,16 113:5,6 141:16 143:10 152:6 156:3 178:12,25 182:19 184:6 185:24 186:4,5 199:24 200:4 203:23 204:8 205:4 217:21 parallel 59:5 param 184:10 parameters 53:19 61:8 65:20 122:17 125:16 158:24 159:1 162:5 184:15 187:16,19 188:15 paranormal 127:5
---	--	--	--	--

127:16 128:20 129:12 175:17 parasitic 55:5 138:16 paren 23:24 parenthesis 147:9 part 8:9 10:6 11:8 20:11 34:22 35:18 49:17,19,20 57:14 58:25 68:18 73:6 82:13 85:7 123:14 146:10 151:17 158:15 162:14 165:13 168:2,24 178:17 183:23 198:21 206:4 208:3,12,13,22 211:2 215:15,21 215:25 218:17,24 participant 214:22 participates 28:2 participating 144:8 participation 69:19 209:1 particles 33:12 particular 10:6 11:1 28:24 30:16,20 31:13 32:1 79:12 104:25 152:8,25 159:17,17 182:2 184:5 197:12 209:23 particularly 5:3 48:21 77:10 159:25 216:4 parties 222:10 partly 73:2 parts 34:7 past 66:21 68:13 118:15 125:1 127:17,19 160:23 165:5 Pat 41:6 49:1 207:13 PATRICK 1:23 pattern 37:15 51:7 77:1 patterns 77:14 78:20 Pat's 4:20 110:10 Paul 116:21 paying 7:5 pedigree 100:19 pedological 141:6 peer 19:15 25:4,24 26:1,3,11 27:3,13 27:17 28:6,7,9,11	28:21 29:4,11 47:23 76:2 91:10 135:17 136:1,4,5 136:8,19,22,25 137:1 138:2,21,25 139:8 151:19 peers 25:6,13 135:22 Pennock 35:22 75:12 79:3 84:13 84:17 113:7 116:3 117:5 119:4 174:25 175:10 Pennock's 36:8 126:16 Pennsylvania 1:2,20 people 8:24 12:22 14:12,21 15:12,22 16:14,21,22,25 17:7 20:10 24:21 25:9,20 26:8,21 32:1 33:6,15 34:2 35:21 37:18 41:19 48:14 49:11 54:16 54:21 60:13 61:9 62:7 71:5,17,18 73:13,23 74:16 75:1,2,20 76:5 77:23,23 79:3 80:10 85:13,20,25 86:3,22 89:7 93:7 93:9,21 101:4 102:21 104:4 107:11,23 113:24 115:2,5 116:3 118:16,18 119:19 119:24 124:10,18 124:20 125:7,20 125:22,23 126:24 128:1 129:12,22 131:11,17,23 132:11,15 133:17 134:2,16 135:21 136:7,8,17 138:19 139:22 140:5 141:6 143:1 144:2 144:2,5,20,21,21 146:15 147:10 148:12 154:9,11 154:15 155:1 158:19 160:17 162:25 163:5 164:2,22,24 166:11 171:11,14 172:13 174:2,7,8 175:16,21 176:8 178:4 180:17	181:11,13,21,25 183:2 185:18 189:9,16,25 190:3 190:7 191:4,6,12 192:1,4,12 195:13 195:17 196:18 197:1,7,13 198:20 200:20,21,25 202:13 206:9 214:7,10,14 215:11 216:24 218:8 people's 177:7 Pepper 1:19 3:14 per 7:3 128:19 perceive 144:6 perceived 45:20 percent 206:22 percentage 205:16 perfect 26:5 39:21 perfectly 32:2 172:14 198:17 205:2 performs 130:14 perhaps 43:25 47:24 86:9 116:6 116:13 129:10 185:11,12,15 187:22 190:23 209:18 period 33:16 34:20 54:3 66:18 134:2 143:20 147:24 178:4 208:15 periodic 47:12 periodically 129:23 permit 173:19 person 6:6 12:21 22:18 24:14 27:6 27:11 69:8 170:19 170:20 personal 199:8,9 personally 25:16 215:7 person's 24:15 27:8 151:5 perspective 13:12 31:1,1 175:6 perspectives 216:23 perspicuous 110:6 persuasive 216:4 Petersen 78:6 pharmaceutical 33:24 pharmaceuticals 205:19 phenomena 34:21	50:25 79:8 88:5 93:16 101:21 106:4,10 113:12 113:17 114:15 118:12,13 119:1 124:15 126:25 127:5 128:1 129:12 163:21,24 167:1 172:22 175:17 177:18 190:9 202:18 204:7 219:6 phenomenon 15:23 54:6 94:12 109:17 184:15 Philadelphia 1:20 Philip 85:5 Phillip 84:25 129:22 193:18 214:9 philosopher 99:13 philosophers 36:23 39:11 45:18,21 60:17 91:6 121:25 136:15,21 184:1 212:4 213:18,24 217:22 218:8,9,9 218:19 philosopher's 219:3 philosophical 30:23 35:20 36:22 43:12 45:5 104:1 119:7 166:6,7,12 213:13 213:22 philosophy 10:18,23 10:24 18:19 30:11 31:17,22 35:23 49:18 69:21 70:10 109:23 131:12 136:20 166:3 204:22 215:19 218:12,13 phone 7:16 210:22 211:5 phrase 67:15 70:13 71:22 144:13 physical 20:3,7,12 20:18,24 21:1,5,9 21:15 23:1 33:18 59:23 102:5 107:9 118:23 127:2,7 159:13 161:18 166:25 177:13,18 178:5 physically 177:15 physicists 32:18 physics 10:14 18:19 20:11 22:9 31:23	32:6,7,17 33:11 33:21 34:17,20,22 35:9 46:12 48:7 116:13,19,22,24 128:13 165:19 203:21 218:18 Ph.D 1:12 2:5 3:5 49:17 190:19 214:6 221:3,10 picking 212:13 picture 35:2 166:22 piece 129:19 130:8 146:12 148:5 208:22,25 209:20 pieces 106:1 130:7 212:11 pitch 51:11 Pittsburgh 69:16 place 18:25 20:8 29:15 48:9 86:2 90:10 101:10 116:7 118:11 133:7 173:24 185:3,22 187:16 188:2 214:12 219:8,13 placeholder 147:24 places 44:18 116:18 130:25 156:14 173:3 211:17 placing 216:14 plague 36:11 plaintiffs 1:6,18 3:14 plaintiff's 30:17 plan 23:5 51:18 172:4 193:16 195:22 plane 63:17,18 plausibility 129:7 plausible 159:6,24 160:20 play 20:21 65:23 74:16 101:22 174:10 Playdough 102:1,6 102:24 103:5 played 66:14 130:20 131:20 playing 54:17 plays 136:11 please 5:6,8,15 6:24 161:16 plotted 74:14 plugging 109:8 plurality 173:19 Plymouth 1:24
--	--	--	---	---

point 7:25 18:13 19:8 36:15 37:2 38:4 39:15 46:15 53:24 54:15 56:17 64:12,21,23 74:15 75:13 77:25 80:11 86:4 88:8 108:1 111:11 112:18 119:16 128:15 129:2 135:11 136:22 140:10 143:7 150:16 158:4,13 160:4,4 164:21 167:9 170:2,10 171:4,19 172:12 174:21 179:10 185:2,16 186:7,22 191:15 202:4 203:24 204:23 207:4 212:2 217:14 218:23 pointed 62:13 103:16 pointing 189:6 points 21:17 37:2 78:10 124:25 159:22 214:13 policy 12:11,12 13:12 70:11 142:6 political 143:18,22 145:5 politicians 145:21 politicized 165:20 politics 181:17 196:19 polygenesis 85:21 popular 11:21 portions 44:5 66:6,6 111:13 portray 76:15 portrayed 202:21 portraying 80:16 pose 37:16 position 7:24 37:17 54:18 55:11 57:5 71:2 72:3,11,12 72:15 73:5 74:5 80:17 81:6 83:24 119:5 120:15,23 122:10 158:22 166:3 199:24 213:19 216:4 positions 72:16 166:6 positive 104:23 105:8,16 122:5	138:19 170:13 176:18 190:18 197:21 199:1 possibly 122:8 possibilities 14:21 59:22 118:14 possibility 57:1 126:6 140:23 150:22 163:2 170:4 171:25 possible 37:25 38:1 86:2 88:9 150:9 169:24 171:10 possibly 126:19 potential 26:15 34:3 54:19 124:16 158:7 161:22 potentially 51:3 114:2,12 216:20 power 161:23 198:23 powerful 121:9,10 powers 120:24 162:10 practical 202:1 practically 197:9 practice 24:20,23 26:6 118:6 155:1 160:3 practiced 32:9 practicing 117:18 practitioners 204:17 precedes 28:25 precise 37:20 108:10 170:23 precisely 128:25 140:17 184:7 predates 203:3 prediction 108:10 109:22 preface 74:9 prejudicial 57:23 96:17 preliminary 110:17 preparation 41:22 prepare 6:2,9,12 prepared 45:13 preparing 8:4 211:21 presence 108:3 222:7 present 140:22 141:22 145:2 149:24 presentation 47:13 presented 42:13	106:10 124:16 195:3 202:23 presenting 22:9,9 presents 124:19 presidential 145:2 press 7:23 97:23 pressed 47:23 presumably 29:4 81:18 95:25 102:3 138:11 187:14 190:10 194:23 presume 178:15 presumed 114:7 presuming 180:10 presumption 206:14 presuppose 112:3 118:10 155:18 presupposed 123:6 presupposing 153:10 presupposition 123:1 pretty 15:9 20:12 27:18 89:18 147:2 149:15 202:15 204:15 prevent 180:21 previous 67:16,24 68:2 179:5 previously 14:23 15:25 46:9 64:18 194:5 pre-Darwinian 66:18 pre-experiments 129:9 prima 20:19 primarily 13:25 78:9 182:19 primary 177:13 prime 82:17,17 primitive 140:14 principle 21:13 26:4 26:5,17 54:3,8 61:8 74:4 75:21 75:22 76:19,25 81:6 116:11,20 162:2 167:6 174:15 186:13 principles 22:12,15 57:11,13,14,20 58:2 59:5 73:25 88:19 90:4 117:8 117:13,18 print 24:6 25:20 prior 4:7,7 8:13,17 9:12 48:12	prob 84:3 probabilistic 59:17 65:4 probabilities 60:16 123:11,11 probability 59:19 59:25 60:18 114:21 122:15,23 123:16,17 183:22 probable 56:23 probably 13:20,25 19:13 47:6,22,25 85:5 86:19 96:12 96:15 103:15 123:22 136:20 154:11 158:13 159:19 189:3 204:14 207:14 210:3 problem 28:15 30:15 31:25 35:20 36:2,2,4,10,19 52:2 54:8 55:21 55:22 65:22 73:8 76:3 77:15 78:11 87:14 101:24 131:13 134:19 136:9 137:21 138:23 156:22 163:6 170:5,6,24 172:11 176:1 181:8,9 189:11 196:12 218:11 problematic 26:24 26:25 87:8 102:4 102:25 111:25 131:8 157:4,15,19 159:16 194:19,21 194:25 195:14 196:10,18 209:18 problems 26:1,20 88:1 100:21 160:22 164:4 190:4 proceed 63:5 109:11 134:10,11 proceeding 3:21 4:8 84:10 process 4:19 18:12 24:8,11,22 25:2 25:22,24 28:9,23 28:25 29:6,11,17 38:10 52:7,18 78:3 85:17 136:2 136:9 144:4 219:21 processes 138:3	produce 52:12 121:6 158:25 183:4 produced 51:16 52:8 53:21 82:4 183:3 184:25 196:4 219:17 producing 188:15 product 63:12 208:8 209:14 production 211:3 professional 29:5 31:11 80:13 116:7 130:13 136:23 144:22 professionals 216:25 professions 132:25 professor 49:9 137:6 152:18 professors 11:18 proficiency 112:19 profile 45:2 program 10:23 39:9 39:11 53:20 74:1 94:13,13 95:9,14 96:1 131:9 138:13 138:15,19 139:1,5 139:11 161:21 173:12 176:18 187:22 188:9,21 189:21 190:18 191:9 196:3 208:4 217:17,18 programming 53:16 160:16,17 162:11 163:14 programs 33:5 54:5 175:18 179:19,22 190:19,25 progress 148:3 218:5 progressed 35:24 progressive 14:20 project 36:22 53:10 60:10 61:7 142:22 158:12 188:5 189:10 205:9,25 206:5,6 projects 158:11 prominent 79:22 168:12 promises 193:23 promising 163:19 promoting 32:19 33:10 138:3 pronounced 9:19
---	---	--	---	--

<p>proof 124:9 215:2 proper 98:7 158:14 185:7,9 properly 36:3 37:25 184:12 properties 122:2 proponents 54:16 71:6 84:14 100:23 121:17 128:24 129:17,20 135:6 182:19 183:1,7 184:6,22 185:25 proportion 129:18 130:14 proposed 99:20 102:24 128:18 129:4 proposition 58:9,10 58:11 86:18 94:10 100:19 102:10 104:16 135:1 168:7 169:4,19 170:16 190:16 201:15 propositions 56:12 97:6 108:19 135:7 135:17 prospect 89:1 protected 15:24 Protestants 192:4 proto 129:8 proto-scientific 91:1 proven 55:20 provide 22:11 53:6 59:16 88:25 95:9 167:10 186:8,11 186:17 187:4,20 210:21 provided 41:21 42:1 121:18 210:3 211:2 provides 185:18 providing 8:8 57:1 100:6 124:10 143:25 184:13 proving 212:4 pseudo-science 36:18 public 3:6 70:9 131:2 142:20 143:8,14 150:25 151:19 194:22 195:3 201:5 207:22 208:14 209:4 211:10,11 221:15 222:1,4,17 publication 105:9</p>	<p>136:23 148:15 publications 130:13 138:25 publicity 11:22 publicizes 9:8 publicly 132:2 181:23 199:13 214:8 publish 26:17 47:23 published 24:8 29:3 40:8 43:9,23 44:18 45:1 91:9 130:11 138:21 148:5 150:24 151:2,14,18,21 205:15 206:17 212:15,16 publishing 25:21 106:17 puffing 199:7 pull 18:14 178:2 pulled 20:11 128:3 pulling 66:23 purchase 197:7 purely 32:16 74:19 186:24 purist 79:12 purported 106:6 purpose 90:8 142:10 216:18 pursing 164:7 pursue 112:23 185:8,21 pursued 14:12 15:9 35:8 116:20 188:8 pursuing 73:25,25 115:16 138:20 164:13 190:23 207:6 purview 114:13 PUS 143:11 145:23 put 12:2 23:8 45:12 46:10 47:16 51:2 54:18 64:25 70:5 78:22 86:22 87:13 91:2,7 97:2 104:2 146:14 147:13 148:1 158:1,22 182:6 191:13 puts 158:7 159:4 putting 14:20 27:20 91:22 99:11 134:16 154:8 162:11 174:11 189:13 puzzle 141:9 p.m. 104:8 110:9,12</p>	<p>182:14 199:11 207:19 210:18,24 219:14 220:5 P47456 1:23 <hr/> Q qualified 49:2 qualify 95:19,21,23 96:5,9 qualitative 17:22 182:22 qualities 126:25 155:2 quantitative 17:24 160:24 182:22 quantitatively 213:18 quantum 118:20 126:25 quarter 140:4 quarters 145:5 question 7:1 17:18 18:20 21:12,18,21 24:1 29:25 31:15 37:15 40:11 55:16 56:9 57:7 67:24 73:14,22 75:4 76:20 79:17 86:4 86:5,19,20 92:22 93:23 98:19 102:22 103:22 116:16 123:22 133:3 136:12,14 140:13 150:1 169:10 171:13 174:20 185:10 189:4 201:14,17 201:21,25 204:14 206:2 207:8 216:13,15 questioned 218:21 questioning 32:3 79:13 81:4 questions 4:21,22 5:7 15:25 37:6 56:4 64:5 73:22 80:22 90:25 100:8 156:4 194:16 209:11 214:23 215:9 218:10 219:12,24 quickly 13:18 quite 8:12 9:8 12:16 12:16,17 16:8 18:2,3,4 24:22 25:1 26:22 27:5 32:22 33:8 36:2</p>	<p>45:17,19 51:3 54:7 61:2 65:15 65:20,24 75:11 82:10 91:18 93:11 96:18,25 100:1 114:9,18 116:8 120:11 121:14 128:12 134:2 186:3 191:2 192:7 199:18 202:12 203:22 204:25 208:24 213:9,24 217:10 <hr/> R R 3:5 race 34:23,24 85:22 racial 196:3,6 raccoon 102:8 radical 165:2 raise 100:23 140:10 144:25 162:25 raised 63:4,24 64:20 65:5 66:2 100:16 raises 156:4 174:20 raising 140:13 156:19,21 209:17 215:9 random 60:3 79:22 80:11 168:13 172:1 188:25 203:16 204:13 206:7 range 59:22,25 65:16 94:11 98:5 113:12 181:11 189:19 191:8,13 ranging 17:21 rank 144:16 ranked 76:7 rapidly 148:3 rarely 29:15 Rasmussen 204:20 206:15,16 rate 7:3 163:9 rather 12:18 18:16 65:24 68:6 74:13 81:15 86:11 90:10 108:25 115:5 130:22 141:9 144:11 161:24 164:25 180:10,12 183:4 199:3 209:20 217:18 rationality 39:14 reach 23:11 reached 211:3</p>	<p>reaches 33:9 reaction 194:10 200:6 218:4,25 read 6:14,20 24:4 35:12,25,25 40:23 40:25 41:18,20 43:2,5,7,8,16,18 43:18,21,24 44:1 44:5,10,14,23,24 58:12 97:14,25 105:12,14 106:1 106:12 111:18,20 112:1,5 133:17 141:12,12 150:7 159:9 192:19 202:7,10 212:24 213:1,1,1 221:4 reader 24:16 readers 24:19 reading 30:13 45:16 45:22 66:5 71:19 200:2,2 202:16 208:10 212:7,21 212:24 readings 208:3 209:10 reads 195:10 Ready 104:9 182:15 ready-made 189:8 real 24:13 31:25,25 90:9 109:16 159:6 189:11 196:13,15 realism 166:16,21 realistic 190:14 reality 165:2 166:22 172:22 177:12 218:11 realization 143:18 realize 110:24 realized 40:6 43:24 realizing 160:25 really 18:2,6,9 19:6 22:4,19 26:24,24 27:20 31:2,16,20 33:12,17 35:3,7 35:10 42:7 68:5 74:3 75:14 78:9 80:8,9,12 89:14 92:2 101:5 103:7 111:4 114:14,18 115:12 118:19 119:7 120:2,20 123:25 125:1,21 128:12 129:24 136:13 137:23 139:24 147:3 160:25 162:6</p>
--	---	--	--	--

164:8 168:25 172:11 175:8,22 177:7,17 181:10 189:16 191:8 199:7 204:16,22 206:22 realm 119:23 201:1 reason 18:4 32:6 43:25 113:1 140:17 191:18 197:2 203:7 206:15 210:22 216:7 reasonable 78:7 106:16 156:6 reasonably 127:15 reasoning 182:21 183:19 184:3 reasons 28:22 121:23 184:1 190:10 209:7 rebuttal 6:13 8:4,8 23:21 29:23 30:2 35:25 36:1 74:15 rebuttals 30:4 rebutting 30:17 42:7 recall 8:13 35:11,18 41:6 44:3 152:15 186:2 219:4 receding 178:8 receive 42:4 211:4 received 6:16 recent 105:6 recently 120:20 recess 42:18 87:1 104:8 182:14 199:11 207:19 210:18,24 219:14 recognizable 203:22 recognizably 166:7 recognize 23:17 142:16 recognized 136:23 recollection 150:15 reconvene 210:22 211:4 219:23 record 3:12,13 4:21 5:6,10 17:14 42:19 48:23 58:8 138:25 139:8 165:6 193:3 198:4 199:10,12,16 208:5 210:25 219:15 220:1 recourse 53:11,11 recruiting 190:6	redefined 30:25 reduced 20:18 21:15,21 109:5 222:7 reentered 110:12 refer 8:1 89:10 152:9,25 154:20 214:1 referee 27:20 28:7 28:25 referred 23:24,25 24:10 refereeing 24:22 25:9 29:6 referees 25:1 28:10 28:11 referee's 28:15 reference 9:10 130:22 183:5 194:2 196:5 201:3 205:1,17 206:20 referred 67:8 77:24 87:15 192:15 198:21 referring 10:12 67:25 68:1 78:25 84:17 110:14 152:18 182:24 183:1,13,21 184:8 219:19 refine 132:3 refined 104:25 refinements 139:16 reflects 34:15 refusal 218:3 regard 19:11 30:4 36:12 37:2 52:3 105:4 118:17 161:22 173:4 186:22 196:18 218:22 219:10 regarded 122:8 143:17 173:17 175:21 regardless 89:20 115:14 132:4 176:17 registering 136:17 regular 21:7 regularities 20:19 regularity 56:24 59:19,23,23 107:9 REHM 1:3 reinterpretation 183:17 rejected 26:11 29:15,18	rejects 119:13 relate 173:1 related 66:12 relates 215:8 relating 41:14 relation 30:9 relationship 8:18 40:12 74:23 174:12 208:18 214:25 215:1 relative 47:3,4 89:25 139:22 172:16 relatively 45:2 47:16,16 71:7 73:8 78:14 87:12 88:7,17 99:25,25 114:22 205:14,23 release 97:23 relevance 70:11 205:24 206:1 relevant 60:25 63:11 80:22 135:22 136:1,10 reliable 27:4 reliant 92:2 relied 177:11 204:16 relies 205:10,12 religion 9:13 10:25 45:14 66:13 92:4 130:25 131:4,19 134:3 147:19 150:15 181:18 199:25 200:10 208:11,19 209:6 209:21 religious 11:1 16:1 19:1 85:15 91:7 130:21 131:6,7,11 131:21,24 132:5,7 132:11,18,22 133:2,6,10,15 134:9,12,17,21,21 141:22 154:13 192:2 200:5,9,16 200:19 201:4,8 213:8 religiously 134:23 135:5,15 146:1 147:14,17,18,19 149:16 191:22 198:16 201:2 213:2 relinquished 86:8 rely 25:5 35:22 53:14 123:8	203:12 remain 218:8 remains 174:1 remember 22:3 60:20 79:2 151:21 remembered 45:21 remnant 81:25 82:1 178:4 remove 95:16 removing 187:18 rendered 109:16 renormalization 177:4 repeat 37:21 102:20 rephrase 133:4 replace 98:9 193:25 replaced 92:14 report 4:3 6:22 8:4 8:5,8 23:11 35:12 35:14,19 36:8 41:22 42:9 55:23 67:17 74:10 81:5 83:5 84:13 94:1 110:3 118:2 119:12 126:16 128:24 129:16 142:19 182:18 191:22 199:21 200:16 201:9,11 217:19 reported 2:1 7:22 reporter 2:1 13:20 104:10 182:16 222:4 reports 6:10,14,15 8:11 28:12,15,21 30:13,17 41:23 113:9 represent 3:14 208:10 representation 143:16 194:10 representative 108:14 142:23 182:3 represented 5:19 126:10 201:8 representing 76:3 194:9 reproduced 211:10 repro-shmault 126:3 republished 26:12 reputation 205:5 require 18:3 39:8 60:2 77:18 80:1 120:20 134:13,15	186:17 204:1 required 72:15 requires 54:5 97:8 153:15 186:19 206:6 research 12:12 24:25 32:8,20 33:5,18 35:4 38:14,15 39:1 58:11 61:7 64:16 84:12 94:13,13 95:9,14 96:1 104:17 105:9,16 105:17,21 106:2 107:17 125:5 127:4,11 128:13 128:13 138:13,14 138:19,20 139:1,5 139:11,12,17 173:12 175:18 179:19,22 186:21 187:7,9,21 190:18 191:9 197:16 198:24 205:15 207:1 211:20 researchers 175:21 resistance 136:6 resisted 21:8 217:22 resolve 145:15 resolved 19:13,17 resolving 19:11 55:18 resonance 66:18 resource 166:4 respect 14:18 51:4 51:21 60:10 84:11 91:13 121:3,4,11 148:3,8 158:17 176:16 177:3 188:7 218:21 respectable 91:23 124:25 respectful 91:21 respective 28:18 respects 30:2 90:19 143:23 respond 5:7 61:3 102:16 responded 136:19 responding 61:9 responds 64:14 91:11 response 5:13 116:16 125:11 132:4 137:20 149:22 218:6 responses 40:25
---	--	--	---	---

45:25 137:23 149:22 responsible 73:2 142:4 175:24 181:3 rest 18:2 20:15 28:17 177:16 197:10 207:7 restatement 135:10 restrict 118:12 165:24 197:5 restricted 14:12 16:2 50:25 51:5 121:14 restrictive 165:9 result 73:14 103:4 122:3 158:25 179:13 results 77:13 133:25 retain 20:25 21:18 retained 4:6,11 7:9 29:20 40:3 41:5 retaking 67:1 rethink 109:10 retreat 33:21 retrospectively 71:17 reveal 8:25 revelation 160:1 reverse 178:15 193:24 reversing 180:6,9 revert 176:22 review 25:24 26:1,3 27:4,13,17 28:6,7 28:9 29:11 136:2 136:4,5,9,25 138:2,21 139:8 reviewed 19:15 25:4 26:11 28:21 29:4 42:10 47:23 76:2 91:10 135:17 136:19,23 137:1 138:25 151:19 reviewers 28:11 reviewer's 26:13,13 revising 152:16 revisited 36:14 revive 22:19 revolution 20:10 67:5 195:19 205:6 rewrite 29:17 re-examine 67:2 re-explaining 88:5 re-interpreting 88:4 rhetoric 70:21 151:18 207:21	211:10 rhetorical 166:2,4 166:10 rhetorically 186:1 200:14 Richard 141:20 rid 16:22,23,25 116:17 174:7 right 4:2 5:1 13:15 16:18,20,22 17:4 17:21,24 20:8,15 21:4 24:4 26:9 27:8,22 28:10,11 29:3,7,15 31:21 31:25 32:16 33:7 33:22 34:5,9,17 37:8,13,19 38:2 38:13 39:7,8 41:6 41:25 46:21 51:8 51:17 52:12 53:5 53:16,22 54:13,14 56:7,17 57:5 59:8 60:18 62:2 63:20 63:20 64:12 65:10 65:13,20 68:3,16 68:17 72:5 73:16 73:23 77:3,13 79:4,24 80:9,19 80:20 81:13 82:3 82:12,22 83:10,13 84:16 85:3,11,23 88:15 90:2 91:13 93:13 95:17 96:20 99:8,11,14,19,21 99:24 100:3 101:3 102:1,23 103:8,22 104:2,7 106:24 107:22 108:8,17 108:25 109:2,8 111:4,7,8 112:5 114:24 115:7,15 115:25 116:2,4,7 116:9 117:6,20 118:1,9 119:9,14 119:18 120:8 121:13 122:13 123:1,4 125:14,16 126:9 128:9 129:16 130:23 132:2 135:22 136:11,15,16 138:1,24 139:15 139:25 140:3 141:13,16,17,17 141:23 144:16,21 145:12 146:13,25 147:1,23 148:5,12	152:21 153:17 155:2 157:1,6,7 157:10 160:13 162:18 163:2,20 165:17 166:11 167:7,16,18,20,21 167:23 169:1,6,23 170:4,6,18,19,21 171:13,18 172:2,8 172:25 173:8 174:4,20 176:2 177:12,14 178:2 179:3,5,6,8,10 181:21 183:17 184:12 185:13 186:7,18,18,22 187:14 188:14,16 188:16,19 191:3 192:16 194:14 195:2,5 196:4 197:1,15,18,23,23 200:20 202:4 203:2,3 204:20,20 204:23 205:25 206:10 207:10 217:13,15 219:15 righteousness 130:1 rigorous 15:13 16:11 63:10 87:25 91:3 96:24 97:2 122:6 132:14 ripe 203:6 rise 15:2 33:13 200:9 risk 145:8 risky 144:25 rival 169:15 river 178:14 179:3 Road 1:24 roaming 178:4 Robert 2:1 113:7 222:4,17 robust 36:20 121:11 138:25,25 139:6,8 177:11 role 66:14 130:20 131:20 136:4 209:3 room 18:13 110:9 110:12 root 20:22 rooted 118:24 roots 153:24 154:4 200:10 Rothschild 1:19 2:6 3:9,13,25 5:24 7:18 23:16 39:5	39:23 42:16,19,22 49:3 61:18,23 67:20 69:1 71:10 74:8 82:6,14,25 84:20 85:6 86:23 87:2 92:11 93:25 94:14,19 96:4 97:17,21 100:13 104:5,7,9,11 108:16 109:13 110:10 111:5 121:16 122:21 124:3 126:15 129:15 135:12 137:4 139:3 141:11 142:11,15 146:21 147:15 148:7,25 151:10 151:13 153:11 154:2,19 155:11 156:1 169:17 171:17 177:8 181:5 182:12,15 182:17 192:21 193:5 195:1 196:9 198:5 199:10,12 199:15,19,20 207:13,17,20 210:4,8,17,20,25 211:7,8 219:12,15 219:17 220:1 roughly 113:18 168:22 route 21:16 25:19 routine 27:8 Royal 15:20 17:8 18:19,21 20:13 rubbish 25:21 rule 173:17 186:9 rules 113:8 115:9,18 115:21 117:24 124:4 136:3 144:3 158:18 172:25 run 52:17 73:7 103:18 109:19 144:21,22 185:14 Ruse 36:4 91:14 124:12,19 209:1 Ruse's 69:19 212:23 rushing 79:6 S S 3:5 safety 143:25 salience 177:1 salient 178:10 213:20	sahutary 180:23 same 5:7 9:21 13:21 18:25 20:6 25:6 28:8 29:7 33:14 38:21 44:17 46:17 46:25 56:16 58:22 59:10 72:1 75:21 77:13,14 101:20 102:20 106:25 107:15,22 113:16 113:19 116:22 134:3,5 153:10 164:5 166:12 180:18,18,22 216:15 Santa 124:17 satisfied 26:19 66:1 104:16 satisfy 36:21 96:24 savor 192:25 saw 103:8,8 192:15 203:6 saying 22:14 28:19 50:15 57:6 69:20 75:4,23 79:10,15 79:25 80:4,5,7,15 100:2 106:21 108:24 128:5 134:20 136:11 137:3 145:9 147:5 155:8,9 159:17,19 164:13 168:7,18 168:19 170:1,3 179:10 183:3 186:2 197:19 198:6,6 200:4 205:5 207:4,10 says 22:13 26:4 88:13 91:21 95:2 99:16 128:2 141:20 166:21 193:15 200:3,11 204:24 214:21 scale 33:4,5 191:1 scared 125:25 scathing 69:18 scene 125:18 182:8 scheme 16:19 219:9 school 1:8,9 3:16,16 10:6 12:13 49:9 49:22 56:2 79:12 89:12 97:23,25 112:17 131:2 189:25 190:2 192:11 195:3 216:15,16,19 217:4
---	---	--	---	---

schools 148:19	144:11,13,14,16	100:22 101:12	searching 217:12	111:2 112:3 152:8
189:7 190:6,11	144:18,19,24	102:15,15 103:19	Seattle 9:6	152:24 157:5
191:19 194:22	146:3,11 150:3,14	103:22 104:1,3,15	second 17:4 51:10	160:20 184:19
science 9:13 10:2,3	154:12,13 155:25	106:12 108:13	84:4 94:23 111:17	216:6
10:3,10,11,25	157:21 158:15,16	109:20 122:6	111:21 112:6	seemed 66:18 70:8
11:4 14:3,6,9,10	158:17,20 159:3,7	126:17 127:11	113:5 133:12,14	90:11 110:18
14:15,18,19,24	159:9 160:3,3,5,8	128:16 130:22	143:2 150:10,19	160:25
15:5,7 16:7,23	160:15 164:22	131:9,18 132:17	152:6 169:3 186:4	seems 36:24 53:23
17:10 18:15,24	165:3,10 166:4,9	132:20 133:13	186:5	55:9 57:12,23
19:2 20:12 21:22	166:21 171:12	135:6,7,15,17,17	secondary 49:22	58:17 60:9 64:6
22:2,4,21,23 27:4	172:15 173:25	143:16 145:7,13	section 45:11 94:2	78:21 81:7 86:8
27:5 28:4 30:11	174:4,14,16,22	145:14 154:16	113:4 143:3,11	90:12 101:11,23
30:19,21,21,24,24	175:3,13,19,21,24	156:5 157:6,9	secular 194:15,16	110:6 116:22
31:10,17,18,19,24	175:25,25 176:4,5	161:2 165:14	199:4	140:19 153:8
32:1,2,4,5,5,6,9	176:13,14 177:16	166:5,16,21	secure 63:6	159:2 162:3 165:8
32:13,15 33:7,8,8	177:23 178:7	172:16 175:18	see 12:24 17:22	171:24 187:21
33:8,22 34:14,16	179:6,12,14,24	176:11 177:5	18:21 19:14 27:18	188:5 189:3
34:23 35:2,8,20	180:2,12,16,19	178:13 179:8	33:10 38:4 43:9	190:20 191:1,14
35:23 36:17 37:13	181:2,11,12,14,15	181:24 182:4,8	45:15 48:13 53:17	196:15 200:14
37:16,24 38:10,24	181:22 182:10,23	186:8,21 195:25	54:7,7 55:14 60:3	202:3
39:12,15,16,17	183:20 184:4	198:12 200:12	63:4 66:22 69:15	seen 6:19 16:5 26:16
45:14 46:3,5,7,12	189:17 193:25	205:10 213:14	70:19,23 72:19	37:6 90:3 103:12
46:16,25 47:1,20	194:22 196:20	215:10 216:23	73:7,19,21,21	117:1 118:23
48:6 49:10,18	197:20,22 198:7	218:5,17	74:20,20 83:2	122:5 130:12
50:5,12,14,16	199:25 200:6,7	scientifically 26:22	85:16 87:21 88:16	171:16 203:4
51:3,4,10,23	201:1,12 203:3,8	46:10 68:11 69:25	89:15 90:17 91:4	seized 113:7
53:25 54:4,20	203:11,19,21	84:14 86:17 91:3	92:1,18,25 93:22	select 45:11
55:9,11 57:19	206:18 208:4,4,11	128:22 132:13	94:23 95:4 97:1	selected 44:24
64:21,25 66:24	208:13,15,18	144:3,6 157:4,15	97:24 98:1,5,24	selection 79:23
69:21 70:2,10	209:5,21 216:16	159:16 176:6	99:3,5 101:24	80:11 125:13,18
73:8,20 76:25	216:25 218:12,22	196:21 197:9	102:16 103:25	125:23 163:3
77:22 85:8 87:17	218:22 219:1	200:17	105:25 110:1	168:14 169:1
89:6,16,21,24	sciences 10:5,9,9,12	scientist 29:2 54:5	118:8 119:4	172:2,7 187:25
90:1,4,14,20	10:13 11:9 12:3	102:3 133:11,14	122:11 128:15	203:1,16 204:13
91:10,25 92:16	12:15 14:6 16:5	134:22 175:1	130:16,16,17	206:7
94:24 95:2 96:2	26:1 31:6 32:21	181:15,16	133:3,25 134:14	self-consciously
97:4 99:24 100:1	32:22,25 33:2,17	scientists 31:11 35:3	136:7 140:8	90:22
101:3,5,7,10,14	33:18 34:4 46:2	77:16 100:20,24	142:12 143:4	self-contained 88:10
101:19,23 102:11	47:24 48:9 50:17	116:3 117:13,17	145:2 146:3 155:9	187:21
102:14,23 103:1,2	53:9 94:24 96:8	121:25 124:7	155:23 156:13	self-organizing
108:15 109:19,23	96:23 97:8,12	132:22,25 133:5,9	157:17 160:2,4	124:15
112:18,22 113:8	116:7 138:3	144:1,17 145:3	161:4 163:17	self-selected 15:21
113:22,25 114:6	144:23 181:9	157:22 175:11,12	170:23 171:20	self-selecting 24:22
115:8,10,18,21	202:13,19 204:9,9	185:14 212:3	176:7,9 177:10	sell 187:17,17
116:24 117:6,10	207:9,11 215:22	213:21,23 214:15	178:2 184:3	send 28:10 29:3
117:18,24 118:11	215:25 218:13	214:19 216:5,20	186:10,25 189:21	sending 29:18
120:13 124:5	scientific 13:22 14:7	217:6,25 218:6	191:21 193:4,18	sense 13:13 14:25
127:10,18 131:4,6	14:25 15:15 19:5	scolding 58:7	194:2 196:20	15:21 16:18,20
131:7,10,12,25	19:9 20:10 32:16	scope 51:2,3 115:11	200:3 210:15	18:11,24 19:10
132:9 133:1,10,15	38:3,3,25 50:19	172:21	211:18 217:10	20:6,9 21:5,20
133:20,22,22	56:6,10 57:8,15	scoping 7:23	seed 190:12 191:20	22:5,12,20 24:17
134:3 135:16,21	67:4 69:23 72:4	Scott 208:22	216:19 217:5	24:25 26:5,17
135:23 136:3,20	73:1,6 83:6,17,22	scrutiny 195:23	seeing 66:19 101:17	27:10 32:21 34:5
136:22 138:2,8,11	84:5,11,11 90:5	200:25	171:1	36:9 37:12 39:14
140:18,21,23	91:13,24 92:2	se 128:19	seem 16:7 25:2	39:18 43:17 45:25
141:3,4 142:20	94:9 95:6,18 96:9	Seal 222:13	54:24 57:22 61:1	47:21 51:18 52:18
143:8,14,21 144:9	97:6 98:7 100:19	search 12:24 33:12	64:11 66:17 84:10	53:12 54:18,19,23

55:1 56:18 57:5 58:18 60:23 61:5 63:5,7 65:19 66:15 67:5,22 69:24 75:15,18 76:6 77:22 78:19 81:14,16 85:21 88:4,14 89:17 93:14 95:24 99:20 99:22 105:24 106:3 107:20,23 113:14,17,21,24 114:13,24 115:10 116:5 118:20,21 118:22,24 119:2 121:4,5,14,23 122:2 123:13 124:6,23 128:1 129:7,11 135:10 138:12,14 143:23 144:8,10 145:15 146:15 148:9,17 149:25 153:12,15 153:22 154:14,22 155:3,23 156:12 157:20,22 159:21 159:24 161:1,22 162:1,18 163:5,9 163:23 164:3 165:1,2,8 166:6 166:10,23 167:25 168:3 171:13 173:23 174:14 177:11 179:22 181:21 188:25 191:18 193:11 194:25 195:12 196:22,23 198:14 198:19 200:23 202:1,20,21,24 203:1,14,17,19,21 205:7 209:18,22 209:22 216:19 217:5,12 219:2 sensical 118:22 127:1 sensitive 148:2 sensitizing 162:16 sent 8:12,12 210:2,5 210:6,7,12,12,13 sentence 13:4 112:5 134:4 182:19 200:2 separable 147:3 148:12 separate 85:22 128:16 130:9	154:17 155:19 157:10 174:6 separated 18:25 separately 210:14 separation 209:9 sequence 49:6 77:12 serious 30:14 35:17 78:17 163:4 207:5 seriously 37:12 45:18 67:1 85:24 93:12 118:19 119:16 124:23 136:24 172:20 204:13 207:8 213:25 serve 94:12 176:16 service 197:17 services 7:25 set 22:15 65:20 104:10 107:6 164:4 167:1 182:16 196:16 222:13 sets 21:6 51:21 84:9 seven 94:20 148:4 149:9 150:5 157:18 207:14 several 10:4 28:1 141:10 severely 136:19 shadowing 149:13 share 132:15 200:25 sharp 131:3 shelf 117:16 shift 37:20 159:14 shifted 124:9 shifting 125:3 shoes 158:7 short 42:16 219:21 Shorthand 2:1 222:4 show 23:8 63:12,24 65:7 75:24 76:24 77:1 102:4 106:3 128:23 138:18 140:25 showed 188:10 showing 76:6,23 77:5 99:13 115:1 163:6 186:17,19 shown 61:14 64:4 102:21,25 171:4 shows 38:16 75:18 99:23 100:2 164:18 171:5 side 6:10,15 11:6,6 29:23 34:12 41:23	69:19 70:8 83:11 88:6 142:25 157:6 211:18 219:3 sides 186:10,14 208:11 sight 113:9 sign 132:18 significance 64:24 111:1 156:8 195:7 197:9 201:11,18 significant 36:2 64:21 111:4 133:2 133:12 134:22,25 silent 9:19 similar 12:18 85:17 116:19 125:13,19 130:6 147:5 170:5 192:13 197:10 198:10 similarities 74:22 77:7 similarity 77:11 102:8 similarly 74:23 87:18 160:14 simple 18:22 simply 142:1,6 188:10 simulate 159:12 163:14 simulated 55:18 simulating 55:13 simulation 18:1 101:15 161:17 177:24 188:13,16 simulations 53:8,15 53:15 125:4 157:22 158:17,22 159:7 177:22 since 38:20 49:17 91:16 104:22 105:9,18 106:1 147:11 148:4 172:4 212:1 213:4 213:4 single 51:5 sinister 181:7 Sir 134:1 sit 162:19 situation 19:2 54:6 55:10 161:3 164:1 167:18 172:10 six 6:11 23:23 29:23 67:13,23 68:4,8 68:13,22 71:7,13 71:20 72:6,20 89:13 95:24	148:19,19 153:16 199:21 size 33:9 skeptical 219:5 skeptical 164:15 sketches 47:11 sketching 47:9 skills 164:4 189:9,19 189:24 191:8,13 skins 193:9 slight 110:21 slow 13:21 17:13 80:4,5,7 small 205:23 206:23 smallest 167:1 smart 102:3,25 SMITH 1:5 snapshot 39:15 SNEATH 1:4 snyntheas 140:3 Sober 204:21 social 10:9,10,23 12:3,3,15 13:2,3,4 13:5,8,23,23 14:2 14:5,16 26:1 32:8 32:22,23 50:7 62:7 142:23 socially 12:10 societies 144:22 society 15:20 17:9 18:19 20:13 32:24 136:23 143:24 144:7 180:19 194:14 197:10 Society's 18:21 sociological 17:12 30:24 93:18 189:22 sociologically 13:16 189:12 sociology 10:1,9 24:7 30:11 31:17 solely 100:20 solidify 180:20 solidifying 181:9 solution 27:1 solve 135:20 some 4:20 5:16 12:24 13:1,1 14:8 17:17 18:13 21:8 21:13 22:16 28:14 28:18,21 29:5,14 31:1,20 33:13 34:5 38:20 40:11 40:25 42:1 43:22 44:12 45:4,11,12 47:9,11,18 49:10	50:8,16 51:1,18 51:18 53:12,13 54:11 55:4 59:12 62:23 63:3,16,22 65:4,21 66:16,18 66:19 68:20 70:7 71:6,7 72:15,17 75:1,2 76:3 78:16 78:19 81:13,19 84:13 85:20 87:25 88:12,14 90:25 94:1 95:2 99:18 100:19 102:3,25 105:3,3,12 106:22 107:10 108:10 112:2,8,11,13 116:5 121:7 125:7 126:2,8,24 127:6 128:1,3 130:7 132:21 137:19 139:22,22,24 145:5 152:3 153:22 155:24 158:13 159:23 164:25 165:2,4 171:11 172:4 174:5,5,11,12,23 175:16 179:19,25 188:25 190:16,22 191:14,21 192:4,4 192:6 193:11 196:13,15 197:9 197:20 199:2 200:10 202:20 203:1,9,14,16 205:1,13 208:9,10 208:10,17 209:11 209:16,16,17,23 214:23 215:4,5,8 216:10 218:23 somebody 19:25 24:4 26:14 65:14 78:24 84:25 88:16 133:25 173:5 178:24 193:6 somebody's 30:20 somehow 28:13 86:15 108:9 110:20 128:10 180:2 192:10 198:23 someone 22:4 25:3 125:15 193:4 208:24 something 13:17 14:10,14,16 15:10 15:11,17,19 16:2
--	---	--	--	---

18:12,18 27:2 30:19,23 31:11,16 32:14 33:25 34:1 34:8 37:7 44:13 51:20 57:22 61:10 61:11 72:21 74:16 75:19 76:24 77:2 79:7 81:11,19 82:7,10 84:25 86:9 87:20 91:24 93:1,6 99:23 103:19,21 107:6,7 109:5,6 110:22 111:2 112:16,23 114:21,21 119:22 122:7 126:1 130:10,10 131:2 136:17 137:22 140:11,23,25 141:8,9 147:3 154:15 157:23 159:23 160:1 161:20 162:1,10 163:16 173:9 176:23 178:1 184:11 185:16 186:8 188:24 189:1 192:23 196:13 198:14 199:2 200:23 216:21 217:9 sometimes 11:17 25:14 29:8 31:22 33:6 34:8 60:18 60:19 90:6,7 192:9 212:7,22,22 212:23,25 somewhat 57:2 66:21 67:3 71:5 72:18 86:14 88:7 113:14,21 114:8 114:14 128:16 130:8 148:6 164:3 172:22 173:12 194:23 somewhere 130:25 song 146:17 soon 8:9,9,12 160:8 sooner 152:20 sophisticated 68:12 102:18 103:9 104:2 213:24 214:16,18 217:8 sorry 5:1 6:25 13:19 23:10 46:20 68:21 84:21 93:23 97:14 150:11 210:16,19	sort 7:23 8:5 9:21 10:10 11:6,21 12:1,16 13:12 14:22 15:11,16,16 16:7,14,15 17:4,9 17:24,25 18:5,6 18:24 19:17,18 20:18,21,22 21:6 21:6 22:1,5,6,9 23:9 24:18 25:19 27:1 28:3 33:18 34:12,20 43:24 44:17,20,23,23 45:2,6,19,24 48:22 51:23 52:1 52:15 55:10,14 57:17 59:4,5 60:6 61:2 63:22 65:15 65:24 66:14 67:1 67:2,13 68:13 70:15 72:8,24 74:13,14,21 78:18 79:18 80:10 81:10 81:12,12,14 85:3 86:6 87:11,23,24 88:4,6,9,13,15,19 88:25 89:16,18 90:1 92:20 93:24 96:17,17 100:4 101:8,20 103:5 106:1,9 107:6 108:9,10 109:7,9 112:8 113:12,17 113:19 116:22 118:10 119:20 122:5 125:24 126:22 128:7 132:13 135:15 137:7 140:19 141:3 142:23 143:21 144:1,20 145:11 152:11 158:1,9 161:19 163:8 164:4 165:2 165:24 166:10 168:5,12,24 174:12 178:3 180:4,5,21,25 182:4 183:25 185:2 186:10,15 189:10,14,22 190:1 192:25 194:15 196:6,6,22 197:7,10 200:7,11 200:13 202:4,22 202:22 206:14,18 209:17,21 212:8	212:10,11,14 213:7,7,10 214:11 214:20,21 216:25 217:1,15 219:2 sorted 78:23 sorts 12:12 55:12 80:13 116:13 164:5 192:1 sound 104:18 108:22 source 16:17 212:21 Soviet 34:25 so-called 25:13 78:11 175:7,20 space 59:17,20,21 70:9 147:13 148:17 171:25 speak 13:18 25:3 31:12 41:1 52:23 130:22 190:17 speaking 17:11 21:11 28:17 78:14 149:2 150:23 218:19 special 15:18 21:13 74:12 81:8 82:15 82:21,23 84:15 85:1,7,16,23 86:6 86:9 88:15 152:21 specialist 24:18 31:5 specialists 191:7 specialization 18:17 specialize 53:21 specialized 16:11 18:18 25:18 217:10 specializing 217:16 specially 81:10,15 88:14 specialties 31:4 specialty 12:3 14:12 30:20 31:21 species 78:19 81:10 82:5 84:16 86:16 86:16 140:3 specife 36:21 specifiable 60:12 125:16 134:6 specific 14:13 30:1 37:19 42:15 72:15 87:6 94:10 100:2 108:25 128:25 172:9 182:11 184:7,10,10,18,22 209:7 specifically 42:14 194:14 207:25	specification 57:18 specifics 36:24 specified 60:5 85:13 170:21 172:11 184:12 specify 53:21 specifying 114:20 speculating 106:18 106:19 177:20 speed 212:18 spends 118:22 spent 204:10 sphere 78:14 185:15 spirit 108:23 159:2 spirits 119:22 spite 21:9 spoke 7:16 spoken 40:1,14 41:13 spooky 128:20 spread 14:14 Square 1:20 SS 222:2 stability 88:3,15 99:17 121:7 173:11 187:17,19 188:3,11,17 189:2 203:10 stage 47:2,4 74:3 stages 87:12 88:18 88:20 139:5 staging 195:19 stand 143:24 196:21 standard 3:22 22:2 27:5 112:19 198:8 198:10 standards 143:25 196:1 standing 17:7 standpoint 17:12 54:23 57:8 117:12 138:8 141:6 165:8 177:23 185:20 205:4,18 stands 196:20 197:21 stapled 142:12 start 16:9 18:18 19:23 47:7 63:10 69:10,13 70:18 103:6 111:20 182:23 189:18 191:11,20,21 212:14 217:15 218:15 started 45:4 70:4,25 81:3 89:8	starting 141:1 152:1 164:24 189:18 starts 29:6 33:12 85:11 122:12 124:14 144:5 178:25 starving 34:7 state 34:22,23 65:22 87:19 134:12 145:4 162:12 209:9 222:2,4 stated 54:13 143:15 statement 6:13 42:1 97:24 98:3 110:3 110:5,17 111:2,9 111:20 112:1,3 126:21 141:12,18 150:4,20 201:11 201:22 202:7 207:9 statements 150:13 150:16,18 213:10 states 1:1 9:6 66:4 91:11 98:3 113:3 126:16 209:8 static 95:10 statistical 124:6 statistics 11:7,8,16 11:19 49:15 216:11 status 15:10,24 148:5 154:16 172:16 stay 218:9 Stenography 222:7 step 22:23 64:20 103:22 Stephen 6:16 150:24 152:9 214:9 steps 52:15 stereotyping 108:9 Steve 1:12 2:5 3:24 13:17 104:14 139:19 140:10 149:15 162:18 207:21 219:19 221:3,10 Steven 1:4 208:23 209:3 Steve's 211:1 sticking 107:22 stifling 193:24 still 16:25 17:6 19:20 20:15 21:2 21:17,20 29:10 46:14 47:11 67:12
--	---	--	--	--

68:10 93:20 105:2 107:22 127:4 134:2 140:23 159:21 161:4 169:19 170:11 171:19 180:19 189:1 196:8,15 215:2 stories 25:3 story 24:13,13,14 54:14 71:20 82:2 199:15,18 STOUGH 1:4 straddles 200:13 straight 17:16 straightforward 18:16 29:24 219:6 strand 92:20 strands 66:24 strange 97:12 152:8 152:24 strategic 193:16 strategy 90:11 106:2 178:17 196:7 Streets 1:20 stretch 175:19 strict 60:19 107:9 129:6 159:24 strictly 156:5 strikes 97:12 105:25 194:12 striking 189:14 strong 25:11,12 34:21 134:17 166:16 strongly 35:22 181:20 struck 45:23 structure 137:9,12 structured 74:23 struggling 191:17 Stuart 124:18 125:10,25 stuck 27:2 55:21,22 141:2 student 26:14 44:13 70:3,7 students 42:13 45:15 49:22 89:6 89:12 97:25 111:18,21 112:1 112:22,25 140:22 141:13 142:1,7,7 190:12 195:4 208:6,13 217:6 studied 69:11 77:6	88:6 201:25 study 13:5,8 34:10 88:9 89:6 140:25 211:20 216:14 studying 13:15 69:13 70:18 113:20 160:8 stuff 11:2 12:15,24 15:2 18:14 20:5 20:15,17,18 21:14 21:14 23:7,8 26:18,22 27:20 29:10 44:17 47:14 51:25 53:24 54:22 66:16,20 68:4,8 80:13 83:13 89:13 89:14 91:16 93:20 93:21 102:21 103:7 113:19 114:1 119:21 124:17 127:9 130:2,12,19 136:14 144:2 148:20 155:3 160:10 163:14 165:21 178:6 181:2,7,19 186:25 190:4,23 195:23 206:10 208:17 209:19 210:13 211:25 212:13 213:25 215:10,12 216:12 style 68:12 subject 13:22 43:12 44:7 49:22 50:6 66:8 74:6 136:6 193:2 200:25 207:25,25 217:17 subjects 48:6 143:16 submission 28:24 submissions 28:25 submit 29:10 135:6 135:16 submitted 137:17 137:20 submitting 132:13 195:23 subscribe 195:22 Subscribed 221:11 subsequent 86:21 substantially 29:16 152:16 substantiated 95:2 substantive 130:23 subsumed 203:15	subvert 156:8 sub-atomic 33:12 sub-branches 78:12 succeeded 61:4,5,6 124:4 successfully 62:3,6 succumbed 217:25 sufficient 95:12 189:19 sufficiently 107:14 184:18 191:13 219:20 suggest 25:2 155:5 156:24 178:15 219:4 suggested 70:23 187:23 201:19 202:2 suggesting 100:14 145:8 153:12,13 157:3 158:5 180:5 187:7 195:2,6 204:4 suggests 61:10 99:1 Suite 1:24 suited 90:8 summary 193:16 Sunday 131:2 super 128:11 superficial 202:16 superficially 202:7 Superintendent 141:20 supernatural 119:23 120:4,5,8 120:11 126:5,8,17 126:23,25 127:9 127:14,15,17 128:8,15,18,19,25 155:5,16,20,23 158:8 164:16,19 165:1 172:24 175:15 176:22 184:7,14,22 185:5 185:21 supernaturalism 119:14 174:17 177:6 178:9 supernaturalistic 185:19 supplied 52:16 support 75:8 178:16 183:16 supporting 210:13 supportive 11:25 130:3 191:5 supports 183:13	suppose 55:16 106:16 112:15 156:6 supposed 77:3 143:24 supposedly 77:2 78:13 177:19 Supposing 174:21 suppress 145:6 supreme 34:20,24 suppressed 145:20 suppression 145:13 sure 4:20 47:21 48:15,22 50:21 54:13 57:24 58:8 71:21 72:1,2 77:8 81:2 104:6 108:23 109:19,23 150:19 151:23 158:5 161:13,13,13 171:24 182:13 187:24 193:14 197:15 205:25 210:11,17,21 213:9 219:16 surface 209:19 213:15 surprised 190:21,24 surprising 62:9 77:4 107:2 138:1 164:1 surprisingly 34:19 36:11 74:1 138:4 203:6 surrounding 213:11 219:11 survive 21:8 172:6 188:4,19 204:15 survives 189:17 susceptible 108:19 suspect 176:21 sworn 3:6 221:11 222:5 sympathetic 200:12 symptomatic 143:15 synthetic 12:19 synthesis 78:11 83:10,15 93:10 synthesizing 205:19 206:10 system 26:15 53:16 192:11 209:7 systematic 36:6 47:13 T T 1:23 3:5 110:23 table 47:12	tabs 70:7,12 tactical 130:22,24 tainted 28:16 take 4:22 5:14 15:24 29:12 41:8 42:16 48:15 64:9 71:4,4 72:11,12,15 73:5 75:3 76:2,5,5 80:17 92:21 102:19 103:24 104:7 106:2,10,25 114:25 118:11 119:15 120:12,15 124:1,22 135:10 137:5 140:2,18,20 140:20 143:7 152:3 172:19,20 173:14 174:14 180:1,20,22 182:1 182:12 192:22 194:13 195:24 198:15 207:13 210:15 217:14,24 218:24 219:8,19 taken 3:17 14:17 26:23 41:18 42:18 43:23 49:24 65:3 72:21 74:5 85:24 86:2 87:1 93:22 104:8 109:4 136:24 141:2 145:19 146:11 158:13,15 180:23 182:14 199:11 207:19 210:18,24 219:14 221:4 222:5 takes 24:25 28:13 29:15 71:3 75:16 75:17 81:6 88:2 120:23 125:20 taking 37:11 45:18 61:24 72:3 87:24 90:10 101:10 105:3 116:7 129:19 185:24 190:8 213:25 214:12 talk 5:15 10:13 13:25 24:10 28:4 30:7 33:7,19,20 34:18 52:15 63:8 70:24 82:15 108:12 109:22 116:3 120:14 122:9,18,22 125:21 128:9
---	--	--	--	--

142:8 148:17 152:7 156:7 168:3 175:22 183:12 185:24 207:2 217:21,21 talked 4:9 46:2 47:17 71:23 92:19 145:1 211:9,11 talking 12:17 13:11 19:10 21:4 60:21 63:10 67:12 68:9 76:11 78:4,5 83:11,17,18,19 93:3 95:25 96:6 99:7,8 104:14 105:21,21 112:12 115:11,22 122:12 122:17,25 124:14 126:9 129:20 134:3 138:5 140:18 144:15,16 144:20 146:25 147:2 148:10 157:8 159:18 171:19 174:25 183:24 191:3 195:17,21 200:4 202:5 211:1 talks 11:18,22 193:21 TAMMY 1:3 tank 9:6 194:6 target 203:6 targeted 194:23 taught 10:16,17 11:3,11,24 12:13 12:24 48:3 49:16 50:1,3,4 88:22 89:5,12,13 90:18 140:14 190:5 191:19 194:22 215:6,15,25 taxonomist 78:24 taxonomists 79:10 79:12,13,25 80:4 80:15 taxonomy 75:2 77:22 78:9,18 81:20 teach 9:18,25 10:19 10:22 45:12 49:19 69:17 141:21 163:10,12 179:16 190:11 208:21 215:1,19,20 teacher 141:21 142:8	teaching 45:12 49:20 141:3 216:5 team 218:17 technical 217:1 technically 83:9 technological 160:25 technologies 160:7 teleological 20:9 telephonically 219:24 tell 4:19 27:7 32:10 68:7 76:9 108:17 125:22 126:7 162:18 168:6 189:5 telling 142:7 150:14 ten 71:7,13,20 72:6 72:20 182:18 206:22 tend 78:2 144:23 166:7 213:22 tendencies 93:5 tendency 14:23 38:16 174:9 179:24 181:14 185:25 186:10,14 tends 14:15,16,17 14:19 24:22 33:23 65:17,18 212:10 tenor 30:9 137:22 tentative 156:3 term 51:13 56:18 71:23 81:5,8 83:6 83:7 89:21 117:3 117:5 118:2 119:3 119:4 120:5 147:25 terminology 204:4 terms 12:9 16:2,3,3 17:2 31:4,18 32:4 51:1 52:7 54:11 55:2 60:6,24 70:11 83:4 87:18 96:6 101:2 107:5 109:15 114:17 124:9 130:9 131:8 132:13 133:13 134:20 143:24 158:23 159:25 168:13 173:3 182:7 185:19 186:11,24,25 190:6 192:5 194:25 206:20 terribly 160:24 test 5:14 27:9 63:17	99:14 104:16 105:23 128:17 132:1 133:24 134:6,17 135:3 136:13 137:3 172:9 175:16 176:6 185:5,7,9 testability 16:16 37:1,4,4,23 46:9 108:3,9,13,14,18 131:11 196:23 198:8 testable 15:18 38:12 38:12,17,19 39:2 39:16 98:9,25 104:17,24 107:19 109:16,21 129:1 136:14 174:6,12 184:8,23 tested 95:4 98:4,9 98:20,23,24 99:1 99:2,6 100:9,15 100:15,19 102:10 110:25 112:7 135:1 136:15 181:23 195:20 testified 4:17 testified 3:7 4:13 testify 105:15 222:6 testimony 36:5 52:21 104:22 129:17,21 222:6,8 testing 15:14 16:24 53:13 99:10 101:13 112:4,4,11 112:14 134:13,15 158:24 tests 99:21,22 100:1 100:5 101:16 132:14 Texas 151:20 text 89:19 94:5 141:17 textbook 90:9 202:23 textbooks 30:6 42:10 56:2 131:1 133:18 165:21 thank 104:10 110:13 137:25 220:2,3,3 thankless 24:24 thanks 94:18 their 17:23 19:12 21:18 25:9 27:11 32:3 34:11 45:5 72:16 76:2 78:14	80:8,13 84:11 88:3,20 91:8,9 97:2,6,7 101:3,8 103:13 104:3,22 113:8 114:17 115:23 117:14 122:1,4,10 131:1 131:7 133:1,7 134:3,22 135:6,17 136:11 138:20,20 160:17 165:23,25 172:19 173:3,14 181:23 185:25 186:1 192:5,7 195:20,23 196:19 197:16 200:24 204:10 206:4,21 222:10 theistic 194:1 themselves 19:17 23:3,4 25:20 33:10 36:24 54:16 76:1 102:20 117:18 165:24 183:4,8 189:24 190:15 191:6 198:25 202:6,11 202:12,14 Theodosius 93:9 theological 55:8 85:12 156:4,5,21 157:8 159:25 192:8,10 theologically 86:5 157:13 192:12 theology 22:22 90:23 91:20 103:21 192:5 theoretical 179:19 theories 34:19 56:19 104:3 112:10 114:14 120:19 139:15 165:3 172:17,20 173:1 173:15 180:15 181:23 195:20 196:25 197:1 202:25 theorist 149:5 theorists 93:4 163:1 205:24 theory 10:24 20:2,6 20:6 37:10 39:21 39:21 49:8 51:2 51:10 54:22 59:20 60:18,21 61:17 62:6 64:13 69:22	69:23 72:19 73:1 73:11 74:19 75:7 75:13,19 83:17,22 84:8 88:2 93:2,4,8 93:21 94:3,6,9,25 95:6,18,18,19,21 96:9,15,18,21 97:11,11 98:4,8 98:10,15 99:1,4 100:6 103:5,9 107:12 110:6,20 110:20,23,23,24 111:3,6,25 112:6 112:7 113:4,6 114:1,19 116:11 116:12 122:1 124:14,17,23 125:2,11 126:3,8 127:20 132:1,3,8 134:6,9,11 146:2 146:7,13 147:11 147:17 148:11 150:6 151:6 162:20 163:7,21 168:1 172:21 173:6 178:17 179:17 183:14,23 188:7 193:21,23 195:8 196:11 197:13 202:19,24 203:18 204:4,11 204:12,23 205:6 205:10,13,22 206:1,3,7 207:5 214:18 thermodynamics 160:11,12 thesis 187:14 214:6 they'd 92:13 thing 5:9 9:12 13:25 16:7 19:22 21:2 24:6,19 28:8 32:12 39:8 49:18 52:17 59:17 62:21 67:6 68:9,16 78:18 80:8 83:19 85:2 93:13 97:10 100:4 105:1,3,25 109:12 111:4 112:20 114:10 127:23 128:12 129:9 132:14 134:9,14 136:13 147:2 148:1,6 150:16 152:10 158:11 159:2,17 159:19 160:11
--	--	--	---	---

167:7,14,20,23 180:3,12,20 189:5 191:9,21 192:24 196:4,12 208:2 209:4,10 214:20 214:20 215:12,20 216:14 217:1 things 4:24 5:5 12:11,13 13:11,15 14:2,22,23 15:3,5 16:4,10,19 19:16 25:21 27:13,21 30:7,14 32:23,24 33:1,19 34:12 44:12 49:10 52:6 52:7 55:12,23 56:13 62:18 63:15 64:1 65:16,17,18 67:7,11 73:13 79:19 83:12 101:3 101:16,17 110:15 110:18 112:2 114:14,25 118:16 119:20 121:20 123:4 127:4,6,13 128:2 129:13 136:7,10 137:1 140:1 143:25 148:2,23 150:4 156:16,17 158:2 158:25 159:10 160:18 161:25 162:5 165:4,22 167:5,11 174:4 175:6,16,22 178:5 179:13 180:1,18 184:1 185:8 186:10 198:24 202:9 205:21 209:24 212:19 213:16 216:10 218:3,15 219:9 think 5:4 9:5,11 14:8 16:12 19:22 19:22 20:12 22:1 22:25 26:19,21 27:16,17 29:13 30:18,18 31:14,16 32:6,12 35:11,17 36:7,9,14,19 38:18,21 40:15,15 43:16 47:18 48:13 48:21 50:15,15 52:2 53:7,7 54:2 58:19 60:22 61:6 61:12,21 63:4 64:21 69:9 70:19	71:12 72:14,18 73:7,11,11,14,19 73:19,23 74:2,15 75:19 77:20,24 78:10 80:10 82:12 84:4,6,24,24 85:1 86:18,19 87:3,20 88:8,25 89:5,8,13 89:14,16 90:2,15 90:15,15,16 92:1 92:25 93:12 95:8 95:9,12,17 96:14 96:25 98:9,24 99:3,7 100:6,14 101:12,17 102:13 102:16 103:15,18 104:25 105:5 106:15,15,20,24 107:1,5,20,25 108:1,8 110:21 111:9 112:9 113:12,14,23 114:19 115:19,19 115:19 116:12,23 117:12,15,20,20 117:20,21,21 118:8 119:12,15 119:21,23 120:1,1 120:19,25 121:2 122:10 123:13,13 123:14,21,21 124:8,10,12,13 125:3,7 126:14,22 127:11 129:22 134:20 136:9 137:2,22 139:5,8 139:9,9,16,20,20 140:1,8 145:9,11 145:16,19 148:9 148:13,14,23 149:5,6,17 151:2 152:1,15 154:9,10 154:10 155:9,10 155:18 156:16,20 156:20 157:19,25 158:2,9,9,10,17 158:23 159:5,5,7 159:8,10,11,20,25 160:16,18,21,22 161:5,21 162:1,6 162:8,9,11,12,13 162:15,16,19,24 163:3,8,10,12,15 163:18,18 164:7 164:18 165:7,13 165:16,17,18,22 168:4,4 169:18	170:2,15,23 172:10 173:8 174:19,21 175:7 176:25 177:2,5,10 177:10 178:1,8 180:8,18 181:8,9 181:13,14,15 182:6 183:9,10 184:25 185:1,4,19 186:10,14,14 188:18 189:2,6,11 190:4,14 191:18 192:24 194:6 196:12 197:19 198:6,18,20 199:1 199:5,7 200:3 201:14 202:15,20 204:3,9,11 205:10 206:6,13,14,24 207:14 208:23,25 210:2,3,4 211:14 211:15 214:1 215:14 216:8,13 216:17,22 217:3 217:13 219:9,22 thinking 34:25 85:2 85:5 86:1 89:1 116:20 139:23,23 147:13 164:21,24 165:1,10 181:16 195:18 217:14 thinks 36:9 136:21 198:19 third 150:11 Thomas 1:23 7:7 8:14 29:20 214:3 215:13 though 8:24 12:22 19:8 26:16 49:9 49:16 62:7 78:15 90:5 105:17 112:10 120:17 190:3 197:25 thought 22:8 76:24 90:23 112:21 113:1 129:9 140:5 141:5 160:9 179:9 192:11 216:3 thousand 71:7,20 72:6,20 thousands 71:13 threatening 26:23 threats 144:7 three 6:8,8 53:19 57:20 84:21 92:22 217:17 threw 56:9	through 11:21,22 16:24 19:16 22:10 29:11 31:19,23 43:19 44:16 45:1 45:8,11,14 51:17 51:17 70:21 72:22 94:1 99:18 112:24 128:4 131:19 133:16 161:17 180:17 192:22 193:9 197:25 198:8 214:18 throughout 12:22 14:15 160:5 throw 188:23 thrust 92:21 113:13 194:16 209:4 time 1:14 5:3,8,14 14:9 15:11 19:8 24:23 27:2 36:4 37:18 38:13 39:15 39:20,20 46:9,13 70:20,22 86:23 96:19 104:22 128:7 132:4 134:5 140:2 146:12 148:2 149:21 152:4 153:5 177:22 189:2 191:1 212:1 216:23 219:21 times 7:16 19:6 77:11 99:2 158:4 212:7 timing 152:11 Tippler 116:21 title 12:20 43:11 151:8 titled 94:2 151:5 titles 150:13 206:21 today 17:20 20:13 32:9 66:19 83:16 93:15 116:7,15 117:1,10 130:20 146:6 147:6 148:1 150:4 162:19 176:6,14 184:17 189:21 204:11 together 9:13 12:14 12:19 15:12,23 18:13,24 27:20 66:23 83:14 101:9 117:2 143:1 167:12,15 191:14 208:17 told 7:21 42:20,21 142:1 146:6	tone 111:9 top 87:23 97:13 topic 11:21 122:20 208:12 213:13 219:24 totalizing 16:14 174:2,9,17 tough 55:16 toward 7:14 38:16 96:18 157:17 towards 96:21 143:10 186:6 track 165:6 tractable 37:8 45:15 46:10 86:7,18 trade 165:25 trades 167:19 tradition 91:20 121:13 traditional 14:16,24 77:8,9 155:4 179:20 traditionally 12:16 34:6 138:22 traditions 90:22 train 189:16,19 trained 17:25 32:1,1 48:1 180:17 training 189:9 216:24 trainings 115:2 trajectory 32:14,14 38:14 39:1,19 103:3,10,13 104:17,23 105:9 105:16 106:25 107:18 203:5 transcribed 222:7 transcript 4:23 222:8 transcription 222:8 transition 15:16 16:6 17:8,15 33:7 37:12 150:2 transitioned 19:9 transitioning 46:2,3 translate 59:18 translated 64:18 86:7 translates 60:11 translating 174:5 treat 90:16 91:5 109:14 132:12 treated 89:3,4 treating 109:7 treats 91:20 tree 76:15 77:14
---	--	---	---	--

80:16 116:22 trees 75:11 78:2 tree-like 74:14 tremendously 24:12 trends 30:24 trial 4:4,10,13 67:12 trials 68:2 tributaries 178:14 178:18,20 179:3 tributary 179:1 215:9 tried 62:8 tries 12:14 43:13 59:20 91:2 143:1 trivial 109:11,14 trouble 112:24 troubled 100:18 139:19 169:19 170:11 true 19:13 26:16,25 29:9 32:20,25 48:6 55:3 69:22 71:18 99:3 102:22 125:24,24 132:22 142:10 145:9 148:21 150:9 154:1,11 155:23 162:22 169:6,8 172:10 177:2 182:6 195:21 203:23,25 206:5 207:5 221:6 222:8 truly 131:9 trust 25:16 truth 222:6,6,6 try 6:24 12:18 13:21 15:12 76:5 78:18 90:24 128:23 164:5 166:25 174:11 175:16 176:6 180:1 188:14,14 190:13 212:6,6 trying 5:10 22:11 23:5,8 27:6 38:24 44:20 53:9 54:25 58:24 59:5 61:2 62:10 63:12 80:3 85:25 87:25 88:1 89:8 90:3 93:24 99:15 105:5,23,23 106:3,25 108:2 109:15 112:24 128:22 133:3,15 135:24 136:2 137:21 138:1 140:11 143:19	149:17 157:23 163:7 165:24 166:21 167:4,7,11 169:23 170:14 171:19 172:21 173:3,9,9,24 175:19 177:19 189:14,23 190:25 191:19 198:2 203:7 208:25 216:19 tubes 207:7 Tuesday 1:13 turn 86:17 94:2,20 156:2 164:23 182:18 185:23 199:21 201:9 206:2 217:19 turned 16:1 33:25 90:5 161:2 turns 15:15 89:20 187:13 two 1:20 24:19 25:3 33:19 42:25 57:13 57:20 58:2 66:3 70:1 75:11 78:20 84:3 88:19 97:13 103:1 110:4 111:13 113:23 150:17 153:1 154:17 157:7 173:1 186:15 209:24 217:11 two-thirds 199:23 types 136:5 144:18 typically 15:18 24:15 29:14 167:4 170:18 218:9,22 U U 3:5 UCLA 50:4 215:2 uh-huh 46:18 58:4 58:21 63:19 94:4 102:2 111:16,19 141:14,24 145:24 146:5,5 150:12 170:7 214:1 ultimate 113:25 156:7 166:22 167:21 177:25 ultimately 52:25 54:24 175:8 unclear 28:23 uncomfortable 25:17 uncommon 75:19	under 4:15 20:5 22:15 23:9 26:12 30:7 31:6 55:2 60:25 82:21 100:3 116:14 144:11 161:24 174:25 179:20 184:11 203:16 undergo 85:16 undergone 100:1 undergraduate 48:4 48:10 217:5,11 undergraduates 49:19 underlining 59:4 underlying 117:13 undermine 127:9 undermining 126:19 187:19 underpinning 22:6 understand 3:17 4:3 5:19 9:18 31:8 38:9 41:17 42:9 51:24 52:9 53:2,3 53:5 55:7 56:11 56:14 57:4,25,25 58:24 59:5 68:7,9 72:10,11,12 74:5 80:3,15 85:7 92:6 93:2 94:5 116:1,1 116:2 120:14 121:17 123:10 127:1 130:6 133:14 134:20 138:24 142:5 145:5 146:22 147:10 149:17 153:13 156:15,20 156:20 158:5 161:4,13,14 170:1 170:14 195:9 197:15 198:2,15 understanding 8:3,7 9:1 12:1 14:4 36:15,25 37:22 39:10 42:12 44:20 52:1,21 59:12 60:8 61:12 63:6 65:2 66:10 71:2 71:11 72:25 78:1 81:4 89:24 120:22 125:10 142:20 143:8,14 156:17 160:6 180:4 184:17 187:2 208:14 211:3 understood 31:18	36:3 37:4,25 76:10 93:15 113:22 138:22 143:15 168:5 174:17 uneven 34:5 unexplanation 171:21 unfavorable 196:24 uni 143:21 unified 20:2 23:9 69:5 174:15 unifies 98:4 uniform 121:2 unify 116:12 unifying 34:19,21 unilateral 143:21 Union 34:25 unique 167:15 uniqueness 167:17 United 1:1 9:6 91:11 113:3 209:8 unity 35:3 201:7 universal 123:2 universalizable 14:11 36:21 114:2 123:7 universalization 65:24 universe 22:14 55:13,18 universes 54:19 universities 10:8 12:11 28:5 190:19 190:22,22 university 9:18,19 9:24,25 45:13 48:3 69:16 208:2 208:5 215:16,24 216:24 217:16 219:18 unless 34:8 47:24 58:18 130:18 163:24 unlikely 51:16 unnecessary 204:5 Unpack 178:22 unsavory 196:24 untestable 39:22 until 18:9 20:1 73:20 77:25 78:23 80:15 110:10 152:8,24 unusual 27:21 48:21 updated 84:14 110:16 usable 197:21	use 5:15 13:13 37:23 38:2 44:22 69:2 71:16,25 74:9 77:1 83:7,8 94:9 96:8,24 111:24 117:3 120:6 144:13 176:1 178:12 181:21 183:22 197:8 used 42:10 51:12 52:23 63:25 65:4 67:15 69:7,17 70:13 71:22 81:5 81:21 83:4,5 89:23 107:23 108:14 118:2 127:22 144:19 146:14 160:7 166:4,10 180:14 184:4 198:11 208:3 useful 138:9 173:24 useless 65:11 uses 74:19 96:23 117:5 using 13:10 16:13 28:7 46:5,8 82:4 95:18 98:10,14 114:5 115:23 119:3 139:12,13 146:17 147:10,23 153:9 168:7 181:2 184:3 202:13 usually 85:2,4 129:23 utility 202:1 utter 25:21 U.S. 34:25 V v 1:7 3:5 vaguely 42:14 valid 131:14 valuable 198:7 variegated 35:2 varies 28:14 75:9 various 9:8 19:15 21:6 32:19,20 33:25 78:2 106:9 109:3 129:7 131:18,20 188:4 198:20 208:11 212:11 214:7 vary 24:12 varying 109:10 vast 50:25
---	--	--	--	--

vehicle 143:18	35:24 36:16 67:18	112:21 131:12	97:2 99:17,17	well 6:6 7:13 9:5,8
Venus 102:7	68:14 71:4 75:3	133:9,22,23	100:8 101:7,21	10:7,23 11:17
verdict 65:14 90:12	81:18,20 82:3	134:12 135:11	102:9 103:25	12:7,14,23 13:17
verges 70:22 80:8	83:2,3,21 87:8	141:6,17 144:8,10	107:23 109:22	14:8 15:7 17:16
VERIFICATION	89:4,17 94:6	149:25 158:4	110:18 113:20	17:19,20 19:10
221:1	104:15 117:7,10	167:2,2 169:3	116:2,25 118:11	20:9 21:12 22:3
version 64:8 84:14	117:17 118:8	173:14 174:13,18	120:19 122:1,17	24:1,12 25:5 26:9
87:15 107:16	119:24 120:20	178:15 179:14	124:1,19,21 125:7	26:15 27:10,16
120:10 124:20	121:3 124:25	180:4,8,13 181:10	125:11 129:25	28:1,6,9 29:2,22
142:12 200:15	141:2 142:3,4	181:21 182:1	130:19 132:16	30:4 32:2,12,21
versions 104:2	144:23 153:5	185:19 187:14	133:6,16,19,20,23	35:7 36:8 38:7
versus 3:15 34:25	156:4 159:15	190:11 192:22,23	134:23,25 135:1	39:16 41:1,20,23
69:23 75:3 131:15	164:1 174:2,4,5	193:13 196:16,16	138:8 140:24	43:9,22,24 44:25
very 5:5,6 8:10	174:13 176:12	197:2,3 200:21	147:25 148:2,12	45:10 46:8,15
13:18 14:3,12	192:1,9,9 193:24	202:12 210:15	148:15 153:9,25	50:4,22,24 51:16
15:20 17:1,1,20	194:16 195:7	216:14 218:19	155:24,24 156:25	52:11 53:7,18,21
17:21,24 18:22,22	198:16,18 199:2,9	wanted 45:11 48:22	157:24 158:20	54:9,13 56:11,16
19:3,23 20:2,8,13	viewpoints 144:19	73:13 130:4	159:5 160:3,15,25	57:16,18 58:19
21:19 22:20 24:5	180:22	185:21	161:18 162:17	59:16 60:9 61:12
25:21 26:6 27:17	views 56:17 71:5	wants 35:19 36:10	163:11,19,22	62:4 63:3,16 66:9
27:19,20 32:13	73:9,24 91:22,24	103:4 106:6	165:1,4,7 168:1	66:9 67:5,11,22
33:4,24 34:16,17	116:6 141:7	138:10,11 173:5	169:25 172:5,21	69:4,14 70:19
34:21,22 35:1,2,9	153:10 166:11,12	192:10	172:24 173:24	71:12,14 73:9
39:13 47:23,24	166:14 174:10,17	war 33:20 200:6	174:4,5,8,11,19	74:11 75:1,18
51:4,16 60:10	183:16 194:9	warming 34:9 145:1	179:11,25 180:16	76:22 77:6,20
64:18,21 69:18	201:4,8	145:4,10,17	180:18,18,25	78:5 79:2,2,8,15
77:10 78:8 82:2	violate 4:24	warrant 89:15	181:10 182:6	80:7,19 81:10,23
85:10,19 86:1,5	virtual 188:16	wars 16:1,17	187:6,18,18	82:8,10,20 83:9
87:23 88:25 91:20	virtualization 178:1	Warwick 9:18,19,23	188:13,21 189:8	84:1,2,3 85:15
92:2 96:20 97:6	virtually 166:3	10:2,17 215:16	189:22 190:8	87:20 88:13,25
97:12 100:3 114:4	173:20	wasn't 18:15 48:1	191:19 195:10	90:1,21 92:9,18
116:5 121:3	virtue 66:1	146:14 147:22,22	197:21 198:7	92:21 93:5 95:2,8
123:15 124:20	virtuosity 166:2	147:25	199:23 200:5,9,12	95:24 96:14 98:4
125:1,19,22,25	virture 15:6	watched 91:15	200:24 203:20	98:9,20,23,24
126:19 130:3,24	viscates 155:25	waterfront 189:23	209:9 210:20	99:1,7 101:1
131:20 132:17,22	visit 41:16	way 8:6 10:7 12:2,5	215:7	102:12 103:3,15
134:4,17 136:24	vital 23:10,22,23	14:14,21 15:13	ways 12:17 18:4	104:25 105:11,23
137:20,25 138:9	151:22	16:8 17:16 19:3	19:11,18 20:4	106:6 107:5,20
140:23,24 153:9	vital 21:13	19:14 20:12 21:8	21:16 32:19 34:1	108:7,22 109:14
155:10 159:2	vivid 163:6	21:21 22:19 25:10	75:22 79:16 99:3	110:8,25 113:12
160:25 162:1,14	volume 40:5 70:5	27:8 28:9 34:14	101:8 109:9	115:23 116:18,23
162:15,16 163:5	152:9,22,25	34:15,17 35:23	115:16 118:13	117:5 118:6,8
163:15 164:19,20	volunteered 7:25	36:19 37:4 38:14	131:23 134:13	119:15 120:7,25
165:20,20 167:15	vulgarization 36:6	40:1 43:18 44:16	137:24 165:3	121:22 123:1,21
167:18,24 172:15		45:17,19 46:16,25	200:7 212:17	124:6 127:20
177:11 180:23		51:5,9,24 53:7,13	web 212:10	128:2,6 129:22
181:7,20 184:2		53:17,20 54:13	website 130:10	130:16,23 132:25
189:4,14 190:24		55:7,10,17 57:21	wedded 68:12	133:5 135:13,24
196:2,18 198:17		60:15 61:2,9 63:5	wedge 181:6,7	137:5 139:15
200:15 203:12,18		64:10 65:13,21	192:14 200:15	140:1,17 141:16
204:16 205:18		66:11,13,20,24	201:6	142:3 143:20,22
206:22,23 209:23		73:6,10 74:23	week 6:17	144:15 147:18
213:16 215:14		76:5 77:8,9 78:19	weeks 7:15	148:9 149:2,20
220:2		82:12,23 84:11	weigh 31:14	150:9 154:7 155:8
viable 129:18		87:6,25 88:11	weighting 28:18	156:12 157:5
view 15:11 16:14		90:3 91:5 92:15	Weinberg 208:23	161:15,20 164:15
22:12 23:6 31:5		93:18 96:15 97:1	weird 173:8	166:6 167:3,6,9

167:25 171:24 173:7,23 174:16 175:10 178:23 180:8 183:1,9,15 183:22 184:9,24 185:10 187:5 188:12 190:4,20 192:4 194:12,21 195:16 196:12 200:20 202:3,15 202:19 204:6,15 204:19 205:2,12 207:1 208:2,9 210:2,20 213:6,15 216:3,16,18 217:7 218:8 well-known 173:17 well-subsstantiated 95:8,16 96:14 went 19:5 20:16 45:5 69:16 123:23 were 4:11 7:9,19,19 8:3,11,12 12:23 14:23,24 15:5,7,9 15:25 18:23 19:12 19:25 20:22,23,23 21:2,10 22:22 24:5 25:10 29:13 29:20,21 30:1,14 35:9 38:23 41:21 43:22,23,24 44:7 45:18 46:9 47:6 55:13 57:19 64:1 67:11 68:2 69:18 71:17 73:9,24 81:11 85:25 86:12 86:13,14,14 87:3 88:13 90:5 95:25 96:6 99:7,8 104:14 113:2 116:6 122:3,11,15 123:5,24 129:8 130:4 134:6 135:22,25 136:24 147:16,20 148:10 148:11,23 150:1 152:13,15,17,19 156:13 158:10,24 160:10,23 163:23 166:9 167:11 172:16,19 175:17 177:21 178:4 182:9 183:24 184:14 185:13 187:15 188:5,19 188:23 190:12 191:4,5,6,7	192:12 196:4 197:16 198:23 203:17 207:7 211:2 213:2 214:9 215:9 west 15:8,19 131:19 Western 90:23 we'll 83:8 106:8 210:22 219:22,24 we're 5:10 10:7 17:4 18:14 19:1 21:4 25:19 26:18 27:1 28:7,20 33:16 38:13,17 46:8 53:9,24,25 54:3,4 55:10,11,12 60:20 66:19 68:9 71:15 72:1 83:11,17,18 83:19 93:3 101:17 117:16 123:4 140:18 141:2 144:16 145:5 146:25 147:2 157:8 158:21 159:3,18 161:2 162:9 164:21 165:2,9 171:19 177:18,21 186:13 191:3 195:17 210:16 218:14 we've 19:10 55:9 66:5 68:5 83:4 92:25 99:19 112:12 137:24 140:12 161:5 175:25 176:1 195:21 196:14 211:3,9,11 WHEREOF 222:13 Whewell 178:24 while 19:20 86:22 99:2 128:8 131:3 173:10 177:1 191:2,6 210:16 whole 19:24 54:14 57:21 122:13 141:4 146:17 191:8 192:24 222:6 who've 183:2 214:7 wick 9:20 wide 17:21 widely 7:22 146:14 wider 90:22 William 1:12 2:5 21:23 40:21 178:24 221:3,10	willing 24:21 76:8 175:1 181:23 willingness 156:8 wins 171:1 wish 49:2 129:17,21 143:17 withdraw 42:24 84:3 withdrawal 42:21 withdrawn 39:24 40:18 41:9 42:23 witness 2:4 3:24 4:4 4:6,7 5:23 7:1,13 39:4,7 42:20 61:17,21 68:24 81:25 82:10,20 84:24 92:18 94:18 100:11 108:7,22 110:11,14 121:2 121:22 123:21 126:13 129:6 135:9,20 140:17 146:9 147:8,22 148:23 153:8,24 154:7 155:8,18 169:14 171:10 176:25 180:8 182:6 192:19 193:4 194:21 195:16 199:13,17 209:2 210:5,7,12 220:3 222:5,7,9 222:13 wonder 26:9 67:3 76:20 wondering 27:22 Woodward 214:3 214:25 word 13:10,13 16:13 18:8,8 20:20 28:7 51:12 69:2 71:25 73:18 74:9 81:21 83:5 94:9,25 95:16 109:5 111:24 120:10 127:22 213:14 words 5:11 20:3 23:5 27:4 32:16 38:10 92:12 120:1 149:15 176:5 202:11 218:14 work 11:15,25 14:5 17:24 27:7 40:23 43:3,7,8,16,17 44:11,22 45:5,11 45:23,25 50:7	54:25 58:14 59:10 61:10 66:6,7 87:3 87:18 92:5,5,19 103:16 104:22 105:5,5,6 109:16 117:14 120:3 125:10 137:6,16 137:20 142:23 153:14,14 154:21 179:8 183:9,12,13 183:14,15,16 187:11 190:13 195:25 197:25 205:9 206:13 213:17 worked 73:9 175:24 working 57:1 75:2 77:16 78:8,17 135:23 175:23 works 29:1 52:17 65:7 167:24 175:12 world 12:22 14:15 14:21 15:11 16:14 23:1 34:24 35:10 53:18,21 55:19 95:3 117:7 118:10 119:20 126:11 128:4 160:6 174:2 174:3,3,5 193:24 194:16 199:3 200:6 219:8 worlds 158:25 162:8 163:14 worried 199:8 worry 25:7 207:8 worrying 128:10 207:6 worship 133:7 worth 64:23 164:7 164:13 189:6 207:6,15 wouldn't 29:12 61:4 89:2 91:24,25 93:19 97:3 112:9 118:20 169:20 188:12 190:21 191:16 217:5 wrapping 207:14 Wright 1:15 write 6:13 29:2,22 30:2,4 80:13 110:4 150:3,18,18 writer 90:9 writes 28:19 91:14 214:24 writing 22:3 29:9	47:6 84:17 91:16 130:16 134:1 211:12 222:7 writings 209:15 212:3 213:14 215:5 written 4:23 5:10 24:15 44:14 92:13 130:7 146:12,13 148:1 152:17,19 207:24 209:14 211:17,18 213:4 wrong 99:24 100:3 100:24 162:19 169:8 171:5 wrote 23:21 36:1 69:18 76:9 124:12 142:19 150:19 152:4 192:25 207:21 208:15 209:1 W-a-r 9:20 X X 2:3 Y yeah 5:22 7:12 9:17 9:21 17:11 19:13 19:22 21:24 32:10 32:10 35:13,16,16 36:12 37:25 38:4 38:5 39:7 41:4,4 44:4,15,15,15 49:16 51:14,14 52:25 56:1 57:10 58:1,1,1 68:18 72:9,9 76:9 81:2 81:12 82:15,17,17 89:22,22 93:14,19 94:11,22 106:24 110:11 115:19 116:1 117:16 120:21 126:13 127:16 132:24 146:23 157:11,14 159:20 177:10 186:2 191:24 201:10 208:25 209:4 210:17 211:16,25 212:22 212:25 213:6 214:2 217:20 219:2,2,7,10 year 72:20 91:16 193:15 217:11,17 217:18
---	--	---	--	--

years 9:16 25:25	1998 104:21 142:21	80 191:10		
34:18 35:9 39:12	146:13,25 147:1,5	80's 68:3 89:22		
40:13 41:1 43:10	148:21,23 150:7	82 67:12		
45:21 70:12 71:7	151:24 152:17,19	827-2001 1:25		
71:8,13,20 72:6				
91:15,25 103:1	2	9		
128:14 148:4	2 2:15 94:14,17	9:35 1:14 3:3		
149:9 150:5	2:30 182:14	94 2:15		
157:18 177:21	20 45:21 91:15,25	97 2:16		
179:5 191:10	20th 33:2 38:20	981-4000 1:21		
Yep 207:18	85:19 200:8			
young 47:16 71:7,16	2003 91:18 151:2			
73:8	2005 1:13 3:2 221:4			
younger 48:13	221:12 222:14			
72:18	21 1:13 3:2 221:4			
	215 1:21			
\$	23 2:14			
\$100 7:3	24 1:15			
0	3			
04-CV-2688 1:8	3 2:6,16 97:18,20,22			
08-03-06 222:18	3:33 199:11			
1	3:55 207:19			
1 2:14 23:11,15,18	30's 83:19			
1:07 110:9,12	300,000 208:6			
10:26 42:18	3000 1:20			
100 1:24 128:14	330 143:3			
179:5	331 145:22			
101 109:23	339 150:11			
11 214:1 217:19	3475 1:24			
11:26 87:1	4			
12:06 104:8	4 2:17 142:12,14,16			
13 94:21 185:23	4:10 210:18			
142 2:17	4:12 210:24			
150 128:14	4:20 219:14			
151 2:18	4:21 220:5			
16 201:9	40's 83:14,20			
17th 18:20 20:1	189:18 191:10			
18th 1:20 22:3 47:7	48105 1:24			
1810 18:9	5			
1830's 203:4	5 2:18 151:12			
1840's 203:4	50 34:18 35:9 39:12			
1860 140:4	179:5			
19th 18:8 22:3 47:7	536 152:6			
47:14 85:19 160:9	538 156:2			
179:9 208:19	539 166:1			
19130-2799 1:20	540 173:16			
192 2:19	6			
1930 140:4	6 2:19 192:18			
1930's 83:14 189:18	7			
191:10	734 1:25			
1940 140:4	8			
1980's 70:4				
1982 36:5				
1987 12:20				
1996 71:1 104:20				